# Smectymnuus Redivivus.

Being an Answer to a Book, entituled

*AN HUMBLE*

## REMONSTRANCE.

*In which,*

The Original of { LITURGY / EPISCOPACY } is discussed.

*And Queries propounded concerning both.*

The PARITY of Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture demonstrated.

The occasion of the IMPARITY in Antiquity discovered

The DISPARITY of the Ancient and our Modern Bishops manifested.

The ANTIQUITY of ruling Elders in the Church vindicated.

The PRELATICALL Church Bounded.

*Composed by five Learned and Orthodox Divines.*

JER. 6. 16.

*Thus saith the Lord, stand in the wayes, and behold, and ask for the Old way, which is the Way, and walk therein.*

Tertul. de præscr. adv. hæres.

*Id Dominicum & verum, quod prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falsum quod sit posterius.*

*LONDON*,

Printed for *John Rothwell*, at the *Fountain* in *Goldsmiths-Row* in *Cheapside*. And now republished, 1660.

*821M64
N32
1660 2

# TO THE READER.

Good Reader,

SOlomon *told us long since, that* there is no end of many books, Eccles. 12.12. Scripturiency *(it seemeth) is no novell humour, but abounded then, even when the means of transmitting knowledge was more difficult; if there were cause for the complaint then, there is much more now; since the* Presse *hath helped the* Penne, *every one will be scribling, and so better bookes are neglected, and lie like a few grains of Corn under an heap of Chaffe and dust: usually* books *are received as* fashions; *the* newest, *not the* best *and most* profitable, *are most in esteem; in so much that really learned and sober men have been afraid to publish their labours, lest they should divert the world from reading the usefull works of others that wrote before them.* **I remember* Dr. Altingius *a terse and neat spirit, stood out the battery of twenty years importunity, and would not yield to divulge any thing upon this fear. Certainly (Reader) 'tis for thy profit sometimes to look back and consult with them that first laboured in the mines of knowledge, and not alwaies to take up with what commeth*

* Videbat enim passim laborari mole & copiâ variorum in hoc genere commentationum; novis editionibus ante cipitem reddi eorum delectū sed meliores etiam, id est veterum illos et probatos Authores è studiosorum manibus excuti &c. *Præfat. Scriptorum Theolog. Heric. Alting.*



1013862

*commeth next to hand. In this controverſie of Diſcipline many have written, but not all with a like judgement and ſtrength, which I believe hath been no ſmall* rock of offence, *and* ſtone of ſtumbling *to the adverſaries, who are hardned with nothing ſo much as a* weak defence of the truth, *as** Auſtin *complaineth, that when he was a* Manichee *he had had too too often the victory put into his hands by the defences of weak and unskilfull Chriſtians. This work which the Stationer hath now revived (that it may not be forgotten, and like a* Jewel *after* once ſhewing *ſhut up in the Cabinet of private ſtudies only) was penned by * ſeverall worthy Divines of great note and fame in the Churches of Chriſt, under the borrowed and covert name of* SMECTYMNUUS, *which was ſome matter of ſcorn and exception to the adverſaries, as the Papiſts objected to* Calvin *his printing his* Inſtitutions *under the name of* Alcuinus, *and to* Bucer *his naming himſelf* Aretius Felinus, *though all this without ground and reaſon, the* affixion *of the name to any work being a thing indifferent; for there we ſhould not conſider ſo much the* Author, *as the* matter, *and not who ſaid it, but* what; *and the* aſſumption *of another name not being infamous but where it is done out of* deceit, *and to anothers prejudice, or out of* ſhame *becauſe of guilt, or* feare *to own the truths which they ſhould*

*uædam noxia toria pænè hi ſemper in putationibus ovenichat cum riſtianis imritis: Auguſt. ntra Manich. p.19.*

*Mr. Stephen arſhall.*
*r. Edm. Calamy.*
*r. Th. Young.*
*r. Matthew ewcomen.*
*r. William Spurwe.*

*ſhould eſtabliſh: I ſuppoſe the reverend Authours were willing to lie hid under this* ONOMASTICK, *partly that their work might not be received with prejudice, the faction againſt which they dealt, arrogating to themſelves a Monopoly of Learning, and condemning all others as ignorants and novices not worthy to be heard; and partly that they might not burden their Frontiſpiece with a* voluminous nomenclature, *it not being uſuall to affix ſo many names at length to one Treatiſe.*

*For the work it ſelf, it ſpeaketh its own praiſe, and is now once more ſubjected to thy cenſure and judgement: This ſecond publication of it was occaſioned by another book for* vindication of the Miniſtery *by the Provinciall Aſſembly of* London, *wherein there are frequent appeals to* Smectymnuus; *though otherwiſe I ſhould have judged the reprinting ſeaſonable; for the Lord hath now returned us to ſuch a juncture of time, wherein there is greater freedom of debate without noyſe and vulgar prejudice; and certainly if the quarrell of Epiſcopacy were once cleared, and brought to an iſſue, we ſhould not be ſo much in the dark in other parts of Diſcipline, the conviction of an* errour *by* ſolid grounds *being the beſt way to finde out the* truth; *reformations carried on with* popular tumult, *rather then* rationall conviction,

viction, *ſeldom end well; though the judgement of God be to be obſerved in powring contempt upon thoſe which are* partiall in his law, *yet the* improvident leapes *which a people are wont to make upon ſuch occaſions, lay the foundation of a* laſting miſchiefe. *I hope that by the review of theſe matters we ſhall come to know more of the Lords counſell for the ordering of his houſe, or at leaſt that by weighing what may be ſaid on all ſides, we ſhall learn more to* * truth it in love, *which is the unfeined deſire of him who is*

* Ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ. *Eph.* 4.15.

Newington,
June 23. 1653.

Thine in the Lord,

THO. MANTON.

# Moſt Honourable Lords,

## And ye the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes of the Honourable Houſe of COMMONS.

ALthough we doubt not, but that book which was lately directed to your Honours, bearing the name of an *Humble Remonſtrance*, hath had acceſſe unto your preſence: and is in the firſt approaches of it, diſcovered by your diſcerning ſpirits, to be neither *Humble*, nor a *Remonſtrance*; but a heap of confident and ungrounded aſſertions; ſo that to your *Honours* a Reply may ſeem ſuperfluous: Yet leſt the Authour ſhould glory in our ſilence, as a granting of the cauſe; we humbly crave your Honours leave to preſent, not ſo much to your ſelves, as to the world by your hands, a view of this Remonſtrance; in which the Authour after too large a *Preface*, undertakes the ſupport of two things, which ſeem to him to be threatned with danger of a preſent precipice, *the Liturgie, and the Hierarchy.*

It was a conſtitution of thoſe admired ſons of Juſtice the *Areopagi*; that ſuch as pleaded before them ſhould plead without *prefacing* and without *paſſion*: had your *Honours* made ſuch a conſtitution, this Remonſtrance muſt have been baniſhed from the face of your Aſſembly; for the *Preface* fils almoſt a fourth part of the book, and the reſt ſwels with ſo many *paſſionate Rhetorications*, as it is harder for us in the multitude of his words to finde what his argument is that we have to anſwer, then to anſwer it when it is found. ἄνευ παθους καὶ ἄνευ προοιμίου.

We would not trace him in his words, but cloſe immediately with his arguments, did we not finde in him a ſad exemplification of that divine Axiome, *in Multitudine verborum non deeſt peccatum, in the multitude of words, there wants not ſin*: for though the Authour is bold to call upon your *Honours* to heare the *words of truth and confidence*, yet how little truth there is in his great confidence, the enſuing diſcourſe ſhall diſcover. Pag. 23.

His very words are confident enough, and yet as falſe as confident; wherein he *Impropriates all honeſty unto theſe his Papers, and brands all others with the name of Libellers*, and yet himſelfe ſinnes deeply againſt the rule of honeſty, and lies naked to the ſcourge of his own cenſure.

Firſt, in ſetting a brand upon *all* writings that have lately iſſued Pag. 1.

issued from the presse, as if they had forgotten to speak *any other language then Libellous*: it seems himselfe had *forgotten* that some things had issued by authority of the *King* and *Parliament*.

2. Secondly, in taxing (implicitely) all such as wil not own this Remonstrance for theirs, as *none of the peaceable and wel-affected Sons of the Church of England*.

3. Thirdly, in censuring the way of petitioning your Honours,
*Pag.* 2. the ancient and ordinary free way of seeking redresse of our evils, for *a Tumultuary under-hand way*.

4. Fourthly, in condemning all such as are not fautors of this
*Pag.* 3. *Episcopal Cause*, as none of his Majesties good Subjects, engrossing that praise onely to his own party, saying, *The eyes of us the good Subjects of this whole Realme are fixed upon your Successe, &c.*

5. Fifthly, in *Impropriating* to the same party the praise of
*Pag.* 6. *Orthodox*, pag. 6. as if to speak a word, or think a thought against Episcopacy, were no lesse Heresie, then it was in former time to speak against the Popes supremacy, or the monkes fat belly; whereas whether the *Episcopall part* be the *Orthodox*, *peaceable, wel-affected part, and his Majesties only good Subjects*, we *leave* to your Honours to Judge, upon the numerous informations that flow in unto you from the several parts of this Kingdome.

*Pag.* 2. Nor can they decline your Judgement, *seeing now you are (through Gods blessing)* happily met in a much *longed for* Parliament: but whither so much longed for by him and his accom-
(A) plices, as by those against whom he whets his Style, the prayers that have obtained this happy meeting, and the praises that doe attend it, will decide in that great day.

The *Helena*, whose Champion this Remonstrant chiefely is, is that *Government* which he calls *Sacred*, viz. that *Government by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deanes, Archdeacons, &c.* which, saith he, through the sides *of some misliked persons some have endeavoured to wound. Misliked Persons?* and why not offending persons? why not guilty persons? when this *Honourable house hath found* just cause to charge some of them with crimes of the highest nature, Our zeale for your *Honours* makes us feare, lest your assembly should suffer in this word; as if your proceedings against such persons should be grounded upon compliance with such as doe mislike them, rather then upon their own demerits or the Justice of this Court.

*Pag.* 7. But whatever those Person s be, the Government it self is Sacred; which *by the joynt confession of all reformed Divines, derives it*
Untruths. *self from the times of the blessed Apostles, without any interruption, without*

*without contradiction of any one congregation in the world unto this present age.* This is but an *Episcopall Bravado*; therefore we let it passe, till we come to close and contend with him in the point; where we shall demonstrate, that in the compasse of three lines he hath packt up as many untruths, as could be smoothly couched in so few words, as any man of common understanding, that lookes upon the face of the Government of almost all reformed Churches in the Christian world may at first view discover.

But before we come to this, there are yet two things in this Preface which we count not unworthy observation. The *First* is, the comparison which he makes between the two Governments, the Civil which with us *is Monarchy*: and the sacred which with *him is Episcopacy*. Of the first he saith, *if Antiquity may be the Rule* (as he pleades it for Episcopacy) or if Scripture (as he interprets Scripture) it is VARIABLE, and ARBITRARY: but the other DIVINE and VNALTERABLE: so that had men petitioned for the altering of *Monarchicall* Government, they had (in his Judgement) been lesse culpable, both by Scripture and Antiquity, then in petitioning the alteration of the *Hierarchicall*: Had he found but any such passage in any of his *Lewd Libellers* (as his modesty is alwayes pleased to terme them) certainly if we may borrow his own phrase, the eares of the *three Interessed Kingdomes, yea all the neighbour Churches, and if we may say, the whole Christian world, and no small part beyond it*, had run with the loud cryes of no lesse then *Treason, Treason*. Remon. pag. 8.

Truth is, in his *Antiquity* we finde that *this his uninterrupted sacred Government* hath so farre invaded the Civil, and so yoked Monarchy, even in this Kingdome, as *Malmesbury* reports: That *William Rufus oppressed by Bishops*, perswaded the Jewes to confute them; promising thereupon to turne *England* to their Religion, that he might be free of Bishops. And this is so natural an effect of *unalterable Episcopacy*, that *Pius* the fourth to the *Spanish* Embassador, importuning him to permit Bishops to be declared by the Councel of *Trent* to be *Jure Divino*, gave this answer: That his King knew not what he did desire; for if Bishops should be so declared, they would be all exempted from his Power, and as independent as the Pope himself. Malmsbury lib. 4. Hist. Concil. Trid.

The second thing observable is the comparison he makes between the late *Alterations* attempted in our Neighbour Church by his Episcopal faction, and that *Alteration* that is now justly desired by the *humble Petitioners* to this *Honourable House*. The one being attempted by strangers, endeavoring violently to obtrude

trude *Innovations* upon a *ſetled Church and State*, The other *humbly petitioned* to the *Heads and Princes* of our State by *Multitudes* therein *almoſt ruined by an Innovating* Faction: yet doth not this Remonſtrant bluſh to ſay; if *theſe be branded*, (ſo he calls the juſt cenſures of this Honourable Houſe) *for Incendiaries, how ſhall theſe Boutefeux eſcape, &c.* thus cunningly indeavouring either to juſtifie the former by the practiſe of the latter, or to render the latter more odious then the former.

Pag. 9.

The attempts of theſe men whom he would thus render odious, he craves leave to preſent to your Honours in two things, which are the ſubjects of this quarrel: The *Liturgy* and *Epiſcopacy*; and we *humbly crave your Honours leave in both to anſwer.*

## SECT. II.

Liturgie.

Pag. 10.

FIrſt, *the Liturgy of the Church of England* (ſaith he) *hath been hitherto eſteemed ſacred, reverently uſed by holy Martyrs, daily frequented by devout Proteſtants, as that which more then once hath been confirmed by the Edicts of religious Princes, and your own Parliamentary Acts, &c.* And hath it ſo? whence then proceed theſe many *Additions* and *Alterations?* that have ſo changed the face and fabrick of the Liturgy, that as Dr. *Hall* ſpake once of the pride of *England*: if our fore-fathers ſhould revive and ſee their daughters walking in *Cheapſide* with their fannes and farthingales, &c. they would wonder what kinde of creatures they were; and ſay Nature had forgot her ſelf and brought forth a monſter: ſo if theſe holy Martyrs that once ſo reverently uſed the Liturgy ſhould revive and look for their Letany ſtampt by Authority of Parliament, they would be amazed, and wondering ſay; *England* had forgotten her ſelf and brought forth, &c. Martyrs? what doe we ſpeak of Martyrs, when we know Sir, that one of your own (*a*) Biſhops ſaid it in the hearing of many not ſo long ſince, but you may well remember it, *That the Service of the Church of England was now ſo dreſt, that if the Pope ſhould come and ſee it, he would claime it as his own, but that it is in Engliſh?*

a *Ad hoc ma'orum devoluta eſt Eccleſia Dei & ſponſa Chriſti, ut hæreticorum exempla Sectentur, & ad celebranda Sacramenta cœleſtia, diſciplinam, Lux mutuetur de tenebris, & id faciant chriſtiani quod Antichriſti faciunt. Cypr. Ep. 74.*

It is little then to the advantage of your cauſe, that you tell us, *it is tranſlated into other languages*; and as little ſervice have they done to the Church of *England*, who have taught our Prayers to ſpeak Latine again: For if it be their Language chiefly that overthrows the Popes claime, take away that, and what hinders then, but the Pope may ſay, *theſe are mine?*

*As for other Tranſlations and the great applauſe* it hath *obtained from forraigne Divines*, which are the fumes this Remonſtrant vendi-

venditates; what late dayes have produced we know not; but the great lights of Former ages have been farre from this applauding: we are ſure judicious *Calvin* ſaith, that in the Liturgy there are ſundry *Tolerabiles Ineptiæ*, which we think is no very great applauſe.

*To vindicate this Liturgy from ſcorne* (as he calls it) *at home* or by your *Honours aide to reinforce it upon the Nation*, is the work of his Remonſtrance, for the effecting whereof he falls into *an unparallell'd* diſcourſe about the Antiquity of Liturgies; we call it *unparalleld*, becauſe no man that we have ſeen ever drew the line of Liturgy ſo high as he hath done. Pag. 13.

Concerning which, if by *Liturgy* this Remonſtrant underſtand an *Order obſerved in Church aſſemblies of Praying, reading, and expounding the Scriptures, Adminiſtring Sacraments, &c*: Such a Liturgy we *know* and doe *acknowledge* both *Jews* and *Chriſtians* have uſed. But if by Liturgy he underſtand preſcribed and ſtinted formes of Adminiſtration *Compoſed* by ſome particular men in the Church, and *impoſed* upon all the reſt (as this he muſt underſtand, or elſe all he ſaith is nothing) we deſire and expect that thoſe formes, which he ſaith *are yet extant, and ready to be produced, might once appeare.*

Liturgy of this former ſort we finde in *Juſtine Martyr* and *Tertullian*. But that there were not ſuch *ſtinted Liturgies* as this *Remonſtrant* diſputes for, appeares by *Tertullian*, in his *Apol. Cap.* 30. where he ſaith the Chriſtians of thoſe times did in their publike aſſemblies pray *ſine monitore quia de pectore, without any Prompter but their own hearts.* And that ſo it ſhould be, the ſame Father proves in his Treatiſe *de Oratione*: *Sunt quæ petantur, &c. There are ſome things to be asked according to the occaſions* of every man: *the lawfull and ordinary prayer* (*that is the Lords prayer*) *being laid as a foundation*; *It is lawfull to build upon that foundation other prayers according to every ones occaſions.* And to the ſame purpoſe St. *Auſtin* in his 121. *Ep. liberum eſt; &c.* it is free to aske the ſame things that are deſired in the Lords Prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, ſometimes one way and ſometimes another: And before this, in that famous place of *Iuſt. Mar. Apo.* 2. *He, who inſtructed the peeple, prayed according to his ability.* Nor was this liberty in prayer taken away, and ſet and impoſed formes introduced, untill the time that the *Arian* and *Pelagian* Hereſies did invade the Church, and then becauſe thoſe Heretick did convey and ſpread their poyſon in their formes of Prayer and Hymnes, the Church thought it convenient to reſtrai ne the liberty of making

Juſt. Mar. Apoſt. 2. Tert. Ap. ad. Gen. c. 39.

Juſt. Mar. Apoſt. 2. ὁ πρεσβὺς ὅσῃ δύναμις ἀναπέμπει.

and

and using publique forms: And first it ordained that none should pray *pro Arbitrio, sed semper eadem preces*, that none should use liberty to vary in prayer, but use alwaies the same forme, *Conc. Laod. Can.* 18. yet this was a forme of his own composing, as appears by another *Canon*, wherein it was ordered thus: None should use any forme, unlesse he had first conferred *Cum fratribus instructioribus: with the more learned of his brethren. Conc. Carth. 3. Can.* 23. and lastly that none should use set prayers, but such as were approved of in a Synode, which was not determined till the yeare 416. *Conc. Milev. 2. Can.* 12. And had there been any Liturgies of Times of the first and most venerable antiquity producible, the great admirers of them, and enquirers after them would have presented them to the world ere this.

Concil. Laod. Can. 18.

Conc. Carth. 3. Can. 23. Anno 397.

Conc. Milev. 2. Can. 12. An. 416.

We know that *Bishop Andrewes* in his zeale for Liturgies pursued the enquiry after the *Jewish Liturgy* so far, that he thought he had found it; and one there was which he sent to *Cambridge* to be translated: but there it was soon discovered to have been made long after the Jewes ceased to be the Church of God; and so himself suppresst it, that it never saw the light under a translation.

*Pag.* 10. We wonder therefore what this Remonstrant meant to affirm so confidently, that *part of the forme of prayer which was composed by our blessed Saviour, was borrowed from the formes of prayer formerly used by Gods people.* An opinion we never met before; indeed, we have read that the *Rabbines* since the dayes of our Saviour have borrowed some expressions from that *Prayer*, and from other *Evangelical passages*: But we never read till now, that the *Lord Christ the wisdome of the Father* borrowed from the *Wisdome of the Rabines* expressions to use in Prayer.

*Pag.* 11. And as much we wonder by what *Revelation or Tradition* (Scripture being silent in the thing) he knew, that *Peter* and *John*, when they went up to the Temple to pray, their Prayer was not of a *sudden and extemporary conception, but of a Regular prescription.* Sure we are, some as well read in *Jewish antiquity*, as this Remonstrant shewes himself to be, have told us that the houre of Prayer was the time when the Priest burnt Incense; and the people were at their private prayers without, as appeares *Luke* 1.9. where we read, that while *Zachary* the Priest went in to offer Incense, all the people stood with out praying in the time of the Oblation. Which Prayers were so far from being *Prescript Formes* or Liturgies that they were not *vocal* but *mental* Prayers, as Master *Meade* tells us in his exposition upon the eighth of the Revelations.

And

And whatever *Peter* and *John* did, this we know, that when the Publican and the Phariſee went up to the Temple to pray (as the Apoſtle did at the houre of prayer) their prayer *was not of Regular preſcription, but of a preſent Conception.* Pag. 18.

But if this Remonſtrant be in the right, concerning the Jewiſh Liturgies, then the Evangelical Church might better *have improved her peace and happineſſe, then in compoſing Models of Invocation and Thanksgiving,* when there is one *extant and ready to be produced, that was conſtantly uſed by Gods people ever ſince Moſes dayes, and put over to the times of the Goſpel, and confirmed by Apoſtolical practiſe*: or elſe great is our loſſe, who are ſo unhappily deprived of the beſt *improvement, the Church made of her peace and happineſſe* in the firſt 300. years: for rejecting thoſe *Liturgies* that are confeſſed by the Learned to bee *Spurious*: we *challenge* this *Remonſtrant* to produce any one *Liturgie* that was the iſſue of thoſe times. And bleſſed *Conſtantine* was herein as unhappy as wee, who needed not have compoſed forms of prayer for his Guard to uſe upon the Lords day, but might and would have taken them out of former Liturgies, if there had been any; *And can ye with patience think that any ingennous Chriſtian ſhould be ſo tranſported*, as upon ſuch weak and unproved *premiſes* to build ſuch a *Confident concluſion*, as this Remonſtrant doth? and in that *Concluſion* forget the ſtate of the controverſie, ſliding from the queſtion of a *preſcribed and impoſed Liturgy* to an arbitrary book of prayer. Pag. 11. *Euſeb. de vit. Con. li. 4. Cap. 18.* Pag. 11.

In his *Rhetorical Encomium of conceived prayer* we ſhall more willingly bear a part with him, then they whoſe cauſe he pleads; for had that been in their *hearts*, which is in this book: *to hate, to be guilty of powring water upon the Spirit, and gladly to adde oyle rather*: ſo many learned, able, Conſcientious *Preachers* had not been moleſted and ſuſpended, for *letting the conſtant flames of their fixed conceptions mount up from the altar of their zealous heart unto the throne of grace*: nor had there been ſo many advantages watched from ſome ſtops and ſeeming *ſolœciſmes* in ſome mens prayers, *to blaſpheme the ſpirit of Prayer*, which though now confeſt to be ſo *far from being offenſive, that they are as pleaſing Muſick in the eares of the Almighty*: yet time hath been, when they have ſounded as meer *Battologies*; nay no better then meer *Blaſphemies* in the eares of ſome Biſhops. Pag. 12. Pag. 12.

And if this conceived prayer be not to be oppoſed in another, by any man that hath found the true operation of this grace in himſelf: with that ſpirit then are thoſe poſſeſt, that have not Pag. 13.

onely thus raged with their tongues againſt this way of prayer, but by ſealing up the mouthes of Miniſters for praying thus in publike, and impoſing penances upon private Chriſtians for praying thus in their families: and compelling them to *abjure* this practiſe, have endeavoured with raging violence to baniſh this divine ordinance from our Churches and dwellings, and profeſt in open Court, it was fitter for *Amſterdam* then for our Churches.

*D. Corbet. M. Nevel.*

But howſoever this applauſe of conceived prayer may ſeem to be Cordial, yet he makes it but a *vantage ground* to lift up *publike formes of ſacred Church Liturgy* (as he calls it) the higher, that they may have the greater *honour*, that by the *power of your authority they be reinforced*, which work there would have been no need to call your *Honours* to, had not *Epiſcopal zeal* broke forth into ſuch flames of indignation againſt conceived prayers, that we have more juſt cauſe to implore the *propitious aide* of the ſame *Authority* to *re-eſtabliſh the Liberty of this*, then they to *re-inforce* the neceſſity of that.

*Pag.* 13.

Yet there are two ſpecious Arguments which this Remonſtrant brings to perſwade this deſired re-inforcement, the Original and Confirmation of our Liturgy.

For the firſt, he tels your *Honours*, it was *ſelected out of ancient Models not* Roman *but* Chriſtian, *contrived by the holy Martyrs and Confeſſors of the bleſſed reformation of Religion*; where we beſeech your *Honours* to conſider how we may truſt theſe men, who ſometimes ſpeaking and writing of the *Roman* Church, proclaime it a true Church of *Chriſt*, and yet here *Roman* and *Chriſtian* ſtand in oppoſition: ſometimes they tell men, their Liturgy is wholly taken out of the *Romane Miſſal*, onely with ſome little alteration: and here they would perſwade your Honours there is nothing *Romane* in it. But it is wholly ſelected out of pure *Ancient Models*, as the *Quinteſſence* of them all. Whereas alas the original of it, is publiſhed to the world, in that Proclamation of *Edward* the ſixt.

*Pag.* 13.

And though here they pleaſe to ſtile the Compoſers of it, *holy Martyrs and contrivers of the bleſſed Reformation:* yet there are *of the Tribe for whom he pleads*, not a few that have called them *Traitors* rather then *Martyrs*, and *Deformers* rather then *Reformers* of our Religion.

2. His other Argument for the Liturgy is taken from that *ſupply of ſtrength it hath received from the recommendation of foure moſt Religious Princes, and your own Parliamentary eſtabliſhments: and more eſpecially*

*especially from the Proclamation of King* James *of famous memory*: the validity of which plea, your Honours are best able to judge, and therefore we leave it at your Bar; yet these two things we know: first, that this *forme* was never *established* to be so *punctually observed*, so *rigorously presſed*, to the *casting out of all that scruple it, or any thing in it* (as many of his Majesties Subjects now doe) to the (*almost*) justling out of the *preaching of the Word* and *Conceived Prayer altogether*.

And secondly, as sure we are, that your *Honours* think neither your own Lawes, nor the Proclamation of that *most famous and ever admired Prince*, to be as unalterable as the Lawes of the *Medes* and *Persians*.

And now having briefly shewed, that *Liturgies* are not of that *antiquity* that this *Remonstrant* pretends, but that *conceived prayer* was in *use* in the Church of God before *Liturgies*, and is *justified from their own mouthes*, and not to be *found fault with by any but a graceleſſe man*: and having likewise shewed that *our Liturgy was taken* out of Models, not onely *Christian* but *Romane*, and had since the first compiling of it suffered *alteration* to the *worse*; and though *established by Law*, and confirmed by Proclamation, was never intended to the justling out, either of preaching or conceived prayer; these things declared, we humbly crave your Honours leave to propound these two *Queries*.

## QUERE. I.

Whether it be not fit to consider of the alteration of the present Liturgy.

First, because it symbolizeth so much with the Popish Masse, 1
as that the Pope himself was willing to have it used, if he might but confirme it.

It was made and composed into this frame, on purpose to 2
bring the Papists to our Churches, which we finde to be with so little successe, as that it hath rather brought many of us to them, then any of them to us, and hath lost many of ours from us.

Because many things therein contained are stumbling blocks 3
before the feet of many: such as these, the clogging it with Ceremonies, and the often and impertinent reiterating of the Lords Prayer, the ill translation of the Psalmes, and other Scriptures, the many phrases in the very prayers, which are liable to just exception. And whereas the Minister by the Scripture is the peoples mouth to God, this book prescribes Responsories to be said by the people, some of which are unsutable to what the Minister pronounceth, some of them seem to savour of Tautolo-

gy, ſome are made to be ſo eſſential to the prayer, as that all which the Miniſter ſaith, is no prayer without them; as in the *Letany*.

4 Becauſe it is ſo much Idolized, as that it is accounted the only worſhip of God in *England*, and is now made the upholder of a non-preaching Miniſtry, and is cryed up to that height, as that ſome are not aſhamed to ſay; that the wit of men and Angels cannot mend it: and that it is a ſufficient diſcharge of the Miniſters duty to read this Book.

*Abbot* againſt Church-forſakers.

5 There are ſuch multitudes of people, that diſtaſte this book, that unleſſe it be altered, there is no hope of any mutual agreement between Gods Miniſters and their people.

6 There is ſuch a vaſt difference between it, and the Liturgies of all other reformed Churches. as that it keeepes them at a diſtance from us, and us from full Communion with them.

## QUERE II.

Whether the firſt reformers of Religion did ever intend the uſe of a Liturgy further, then to be an help, in the want, or to the weakneſſe of a Miniſter.

1 All other reformed Churches, though they uſe Liturgies, yet doe no binde their Miniſters to the uſe of them.

2 A Rubrick in King *Edwards* book left it unto the diſcretion of the Miniſter, what and how much to read, when there was a Sermon.

3 The Homilies which are appointed to be read, are left free either to be read or not, by preaching Miniſters; and why not then the Liturgy? eſpecially conſidering that the ability to offer up the peoples wants to God in prayer is part of the Miniſterial office, as well as preaching. And if it can be thought no leſſe then ſacriledge to rob the people of the Miniſters gift in preaching, and to tye them to Homilies, it can be no leſſe, to deprive them of their gift in prayer.

4 The ground of the firſt binding of it upon all to uſe, was not to tye godly men from exerciſing their gift in prayer; but the old Popiſh Prieſts, that by a ſeeming returne to our Religion did through indulgence retaine their places, from returning to the old Maſſe.

5 That which makes many refuſe to be preſent at our Church ſervice, is not onely the Liturgy it ſelf, but the impoſing of it upon Miniſters. And we finde no way to recover our people to a ſtinted prayer, but by leaving it free to uſe or not to uſe.

*Ob.* If it be objected, that this will breed diviſions and diſturbances

ces in Churches, unleſſe there be a uniformity, and that there are many unable.

It hath not bred any diſturbance in other reformed Churches. *Anſ.*

Why ſhould the free liberty of uſing or not uſing a Liturgy, breed more confuſion then the free liberty of reading or not reading Homilies? eſpecially when Miniſters ſhall teach people, not to condemne one another in things indifferent. 2

If there be a care taken in thoſe that have the power to make Miniſters, to chooſe men gifted as well for prayer as preaching, there cannot be conceived how any inconvenience ſhould follow. Or if afterwards it ſhould appeare, that any Miniſter ſhould prove inſufficient to diſcharge the duty of prayer in a conceived way, it may be impoſed on him as a puniſhment, to uſe ſet forms and no other. But why any Miniſter that hath the gift of prayer, in an abundant meaſure, as well as of preaching, ſhould be hindered from exerciſing his gift well, becauſe another uſeth it ill, is a new Divinity never heard of in Gods Church, till Biſhop *Wrens* dayes, who forbad all uſe of conceived prayer in the Church. 3

## SECT. III.

WE come now with your *Honours favour*, to the ſecond point diſputed in this Remonſtrance, *Epiſcopacy it ſelfe*, againſt which, whatſoever hath been either ſpoken or written by any, either *learned Divines*, or *well-reformed Churches* (as his conſcience knows, there are of both that have writ againſt it) is Taxed by him as no other then the *unjuſt Clamors either of weak or factious perſons*. Sure the man thinkes he hath obtained a *Monopoly* of learning, and all *Knowledge* is lockt up in his *boſome*; and not onely *Knowledge* but *piety* and *peaceableneſſe* too; for all that are not of his opinion, muſt ſuffer either as weak or factious, if he may be their Judge. We know not what this Arrogancy might attempt to faſten upon your *Honours*, ſhould the *bowels* of your compaſſion be enlarged, to weigh in the Ballance of your wiſedomes, the *multitude* of *Humble petitions*, preſented to you from ſeveral parts of this Kingdome, that hath long groaned under the Iron and Inſupportable yoake of this *Epiſcopal Government*, which yet we doubt not, but your *Honours* will pleaſe to take into your prudent and pious conſideration: Eſpecially knowing it is their continual practiſe to loade with the odious names of *Faction* all that juſtly complaine of their *injuſt oppreſſion*. *Pag.* 17. *Pag.* 17.

In

*Pag.* 17. In his addresse to his defence of Episcopacy, he makes an unhappy confession *that he is confounded in himselfe.* Your Honours may in this believe him; for he that readeth this remonstrance, may easily observe so many falsities and contradictions, (though presented to publike view, with a face of confident boldnesse,) as could not fall from the Pen of any, but *self-confounded man*: which though we doubt not but *your Honours* have descryed; yet because they are hid from an errant and unobserving eye, under the Embroyderies of a silken Language, we Humbly crave your Honours leave to put them one by one upon the file, that the world may see what credit is to be given to the bold assertions of this confident Remonstrant.

1

* *Pag.* 2. *a* One of these Sonnes of the Church of England whose messenger this Remonstrant is, was he who swore by the Eternal God, he would be the death of those that did appeare to move against the grievances of Episcopacy; and if the rest of these Millions mentioned pag. 2. whose thousands are so punctually calculated p. 41. be of his spirit, they are an army of very peaceable & right-affected men.

First, in his second page, he dubs his book * *the faithful messenger of all* (a) *the peaceable and right affected sons of the Church of England:* which words (besides that unchristian *Theta*, which as we already observed, they set upon all that are not of his party,) carry in the bowels of them a notorious falsity and contradiction to the phrase of the book; for how could this book be the messenger of all *his own party* in England, when it is not to be imagined, that all could know of the coming forth of this book before it was published? and how can that book crave admittance in *all their names*, that speakes in the singular number, and as in the person of one man almost tht whole book thorow.

2

*Pag.* 7. *Evaristus.* 100. *Dionysius.* 260. Some say 267. as *Pol. Virg.*

But it may be some will say, this is but a small slip; well be it so: but in the seventh page he layes it on in four lines, asserting these four things: First, that *Episcopall Government*, (that very same Episcopal Government, which some *he saith seeke to wound*, that is Government by Diocesan Bishops) derives it self from the Apostles times; which though we shall *συν θεῷ* more fully confute anon, yet we cannot here but rank it among his notorious----: for how could there be such Government of a Diocesse by a Bishop derived from the Apostles times, when in the Apostles times there were no Bishops distinct from Presbyters, as we shall shew? and if there had been Bishops, yet they were no Diocesans; for it was a hundred yeares after Christ, or as most agree 260. before Parishes were distinguished, and there must be a distinction of Parishes before there could be an union of them into Diocesses.

Secondly, it is by *the joynt confession of all reformed Divines granted, that this sacred Government is derived from the Apostles:* What all reformed Divines? was *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Junius*, *&c.* of that minde? Are the reformed Churches of *France*, *Scotland*, *Netherlands*, of that Judgement? we shall shew anon that there is no

*Pag.* 13,14.

more

more truth in this Assertion then if he had said with *Anaxagoras*, snow is black, or with *Copernicus*, the Earth moves, and the Heavens stand stil.

Thirdly, he saith this *Government hath continued without any interruption*: What doth he meane, at *Rome*? for we reade in some places of the world this Government was never known for many yeares together: as in *Scotland*, we read that in Ancient times the *Scots* were instructed in the Christian faith by Priests and Monkes, and were without Bishops 290. yeares: yea to come to *England*, we would desire to know of this Remonstrant whether God had a Church in *England* in Q. *Maries* dayes or no? and if so, who were then the Bishops of this Church, for some there must be, if it be true that this man saith, this Government hath continued without any interruption unto this day, and Bishops then we know not where to finde but in the line of Popish succession. 3 *John Maior l.2.Hist. de gest. Scot. Cap.2.*

Fourthly, he saith it hath thus continued *without the contradiction of any one Congregation in the Christian world.* It seemes he hath forgotten, what their own darling *Heylin* hath written of the people of *Biscay in Spaine*, that they admit of no Bishops to come among them; for when *Ferdinand* the Catholike came in progresse accompanied among others with the Bishop of *Pampelone*, *the people* rose up in Armes, drove back the Bishop, and gathering up all the dust which they thought he had trode on, flung it into the Sea. *Heylins Geog.p.55.*

Which story had it been recorded onely by him, would have been of lighter Credit. But we reade the same in the Spanish Chronicle, who saith more then the Doctor: for he tels us that the People threw that dust that the Bishop or his Mule had trode on, into the Sea with *Curses and Imprecations*: which certainly saith he was not done without some *Mystery*, those people not being voide of Religion, but superstitiously devout as the rest of the Spaniards are: so that there is one Congregation in the Christian world in which this Government hath met with contradiction. *Gener. Hist. of Spain l.22*

And are not the *French*, *Scottish*, and *Belgick* Churches worthy to be counted Christian Congregations? and who knowes not that amongst these this Government hath met not onely with verbal but reall contradiction?

Yet he cannot leave his—: But within two pages is at it againe; and *tels us of an unquestionable clearenesse wherein it hath been from the Apostles derived to us*: how unquestionable? when 6 *Pag. 9.*

the

the many volumes written about it, witneſſe to the world, and to his *conſcience*, it hath been as much queſtioned as any point (almoſt) in our Religion.

7 And that aſſertion of his that tels us that the people of God *had a forme of prayer as ancient as Moſes, which was conſtantly practiſed to the Apoſtles dayes, and by the Apoſtles, &c.* though we have ſhewed how bold and falſe this aſſertion is, yet we mention it here as deſerving to be put into the Catalogue.

8 And that he may not ſeem *Contra mentem ire*, but to be of the
Pag. 18. ſame minde ſtill, *p.* 18. he *ſaith, Epiſcopal Government hath continued in this Iſland ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel without contradiction.* Had he taken a leſſe ſpace of time, and ſaid but ſince the *reſuſcitation* of the Goſpel: we can prove it to him and ſhall, that ſince the reformation, Epiſcopacy hath been more contradicted, then ever the Papacy was before the extirpation of it.

9 Yet ſtill the man runs on, thinking to get credit to his untruths by their multiplications; for *pag.* 21. he ſaith; *Certainly, except all Hiſtories, all Authors faile us, nothing can be more certaine then this truth: Os Durum!* Nothing more certaine! what is it not more certain that there is a God? is it not more certain that Chriſt is God and man? is it not more certain that Chriſt is the only Saviour of the world? Nothing more certain! muſt this then be an Article of our Creed, the corner ſtone of our Religion? muſt this be of neceſſity to Salvation? Nothing more certain! O that men ſhould not onely forget themſelves, but God alſo: and in their zeale for their own Honour utter words bordering upon *Blaſphemy.*

Indignation will not ſuffer us to proſecute theſe falſities of his any further; we will leave this diſpleaſing ſervice, onely
Pag. 18. retorting the words of this Remonſtrant upon himſelf, *Surely could he look with our eyes* (or any eyes that were not partial) *he would ſee cauſe to be throughly aſhamed of theſe his groſſe injurious miſcarriages, and ſhould be forced to confeſſe, that never good cauſe* (if cauſe be good) *had more reaſon to complaine of a ſinful proſecution.*

## SECT. IV.

WE will now come with your Honours patience, to weigh whether there be any more ſtrength in his arguments, then there is truth in his aſſertions.

His Plea for Epiſcopacy conſiſts of two parts. In the firſt he brings

brings arguments for the ſupporting of it. In the ſecond he undertakes to anſwer the objections that may be made againſt it.

His firſt argument for it, is couched in theſe words; *Were this Ordinance meerly Humane or Eccleſiaſtical, if there could no more be ſaid for it, but that it is exceeding Ancient, of more then* 15. *hundred years, &c.* The ſtrength of which argument lies in this, that they haye been in peaceable poſſeſſion of this government fifteen hundered years and upwards; and in this Iſland ever ſince the Goſpel, without contradiction.

In which words he ſpeaks two things which deſerve juſt cenſure. Firſt, that the Hierarchical Government hath continued for fifteen hundred years; therefore ſhould not now be altered; which may well be called, as *Hierom* in another Caſe, *Argumentum Galeatum, an Argument calculated for the Meridian of Epiſcopacy, and may indifferently ſerve for all Religions in the World:* For thus the Jews might have pleaded againſt Chriſt the Antiquity of more then ſo many hundred years; and thus the Heathens did plead againſt the Chriſtian Religion, which *Juſtin Martyr* in his Apology anſwers. And by this Argument the Pope ſits as faſt rivetted in his chayre at Rome, as ours in theirs: whoſe Plea for Antiquity runs parallel with theirs. It is a good obſervation of *Cyprian*, that Chriſt ſaid, *Ego ſum via, veritas & vita*; not *Ego ſum conſuetudo*; and * that *Conſuetudo ſine veritate eſt vetuſtas erroris*, Chriſt is Truth, and not Cuſtome; and Cuſtome withou Truth, is a mouldy error: and as Sir *Francis Bacon* ſaith, *Antiquity without Truth, is a Cypher without a Figure.*

Yet had this *b* Remonſtrant been as well verſed in Antiquity, as he would bear the world in hand he hath, he might have found Learned Ancients affirming, there was a Time when the Church was not governed by Biſhops, but by Presbyters. And when by Biſhops, he might further have ſeen more affinity between our Biſhops and the Pope of Rome, then between the Primitive Biſhops and them. And that as King *James* of famous memory, ſaid of the Religion of *England*, that it differed no more from Rome, then Rome did from what it was at firſt; may as truly be ſaid of Biſhops, that we differ no more from them then they do from what Biſhops were, when firſt they were rai-

* *Fruſtra conſuetudinem nobis opponunt, quaſi conſuetudo major ſit veritate, aut non id ſit in ſpiritualibus ſequendum, quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto Revelatum: Cypr. Ep.* 73.

*b* It is wel obſerved by *Gerhard*, that a Biſhop *Phraſi Apoſtolicâ*, that is, the Biſhop that is the ſame with a Presbyter, is of fifteen hundred years ſtanding; but a Biſhop *Phraſi Pontificiâ*, that is, a diſtinct order ſuperiour to a Preſbyter, inveſted with ſole power of Ordination and Iuriſdiction, is but a Novell Invention.

ſed unto this eminency: which difference we ſhall ſhew in our enſuing Diſcourſe, to be ſo great, that as he ſaid of Rome, he did *Romam in Roma quærere*, he ſought Rome in Rome; ſo wee *Epiſcopatum in Epiſcopatu*, may go ſeek for a *Biſhop among all our Biſhops*.

And whereas in his application of this Argument to the Biſhops of this Nation, he ſaith, *It hath continued in this Iſland ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel, without contradiction*; which is his *Second* in this Argument: How falſe this is, we have declared already; and we all know, and himſelfe cannot but know, that there is no one thing ſince the reformation, that hath met with ſo much *Contradiction* as *Epiſcopacy* hath done; witneſs the ſeveral Books written in the Reigns of our ſeveral Princes, and the many *Petitions* exhibited to our ſeveral *Parliaments*, and the many ſpeeches made therein againg *Epiſcopal Government*: many of which are yet extant.

*Pag.* 19.

*Pag.* 19. As for that ſupply of Acceſſory ſtrength, which he begs to this Argument, from the *light of nature, and the rules of juſt policy, which* (ſaith he) *teacheth us not eaſily to give way to the change of thoſe things which long uſe and many* * *Laws have firmly eſtabliſhed, as Neceſſary and Beneficial*; it is evident, that thoſe things which to former Ages have ſeemed *Neceſſary* and *Beneficial*, may to ſucceeding Generations, prove not *Neceſſary* but *Noxious*, not *Beneficial*, but *Burthenſome*; And then the ſame *light of nature*, and the ſame *juſt policy*, that did at the firſt command the eſtabliſhment of them, may and will perſwade their *Aboliſhment*; if not, either our Parliaments muſt never Repeale any of their former Acts (which yet they have juſtly and wiſely done) or elſe in ſo doing muſt run Counter to the *light of nature*, and the *Rules of juſt policy*; which to think were an impiety to be puniſhed by the Iudge.

* What the eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy by the Lawes is, and upon what grounded, the learned Sir *Edward Cook* informes us, who reports, That in an Act of Parliament holden at *Carlile* in the 25. year of *Edw.* 1. it is declared that the holy Church of England was founded in the ſtate of Prelacy within the Realm of England, by the King and his Pregenitors, &c. for them to inform the people in the Law of God, and to keep hoſpitality, and give almes, and do other works of charity. And the ſaid Kings in times paſt were wont to have their advice and counſel for the ſafe-guard of the Realme, when they had need of ſuch Prelates and Clerks ſo advanced. *Cook de jure Regis Eccleſiaſtico.* But whether Biſhops have obſerved the Orders of their firſt foundation, &c.

## SECT. V.

*Pag.* 19. 20. THe Second Argument for the defence of Epiſcopal Government, is from the *Pedigree of this holy Calling, which he derives from no leſs then an Apoſtolical, and in that right divine inſti-*

*tution*

*tation*; and assayes to prove it from the practice of the Apostles and as he saith, the *clear practice of their Successors, continued in Christs Church to this very day:* And to this Argument he so much confides, that he concludes it with this *Triumphant Epiphonema, What scruple can remain in any ingenuous heart?* And determins, *if any continue yet unsatisfied, it is in despight of reason, and all evidence of History, and because he wilfully shuts his eyes with a purpose not to see the light.* Bona verba. Pag. 21.

By your favour Sir, we will tell you notwithstanding the supposed strength of your argumentation, there is one scruple yet remaining; and if you would know upon what ground, it is this; because we find in Scripture (which by your own confession is *Original Authority*) that Bishops and Presbyters were *Originally* the same, though afterwards they came to be distinguished: and in process of time, Episcopacy did swallow up all the *honor* and *power* of the Presbytery, as *Pharaoh*'s lean Kine did the fat. Pag. 8.

Their Identity is discernable: first, from the same names given unto both: secondly, from the same office designed unto both in Scripture. As for the names, are not the same names given unto both in Sacred Writ? Let the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses of the first Chapter to *Titus* testifie: in the fifth verse, the Apostle shews that he left *Titus* in Creet to ordain Elders in every City; in the sixth verse, he gives a delineation of the persons that are capable of such Ordination: and in the seventh, the Reason, why the person to be ordained, must be so qualified: *for a Bishop, &c.* Now if the Bishop and Elder be not here the same, but names of distinct office and order, the Apostles reason rendred in the seventh verse of his direction in the fifth and sixth verses, is (with reverence be it spoken) inconsequential, and his demand unjust. If a Chancellor in one of the Universities should give order to his Vice-Chancellor to admit none to the degree of Batchelour in Arts, but such as were able to preach, or keep a Divinity Act: *For Batchelours in Divinity must be so*: what reason or equity were in this? So if *Paul* leaving *Titus* as his *Locum tenens*, as it were in Creet for a season, should give order to him not to admit any to be an *Elder* but one thus and thus qualified, because a Bishop must be so: had a Bishop been an Order or Calling distinct from, or superior to a Presbyter, and not the same, this had been no more rational or equal then the former: therefore under the name of Bishop in the seventh verse the Apostle intends the Elder mentioned in the fifth verse. Consonant to this is the Language of the same Apostle, *Acts.* 20. v. 17 18. where such as in 17. verse he calls πρεσβύτερους, *Elders*, in the 18. he calls ἐπισκόπους, in ordinary English, *Bishops*, though our Tran-

lation there, (we know not for what reason) reads it *Overseers:* not so rendring the word in any other Text.

And though this Remonstrant undertakes to shew a clear and received distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, & Deacons, *as three distinct subordinate Callings in Gods Church, with an evident specification of the duty & charge belonging to each of them, or else let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever hooted out of the Church:* Yet let us tell him, that we never find in Scripture these three Orders, *Bishops, Presbyters,* and *Deacons,* mentioned together: but onely *Bishops* and *Deacons,* as *Phil.* 1. and 1. *Tim.* Nor do we find in Scripture any *Ordination* to the office of a Bishop, differing from the *Ordination* of an Elder: Nor do we find in Scripture, the specification of any Duty charged upon a Bishop, that Elders are secluded from: Nor any qualification required in a Bishop, that is not requisite in *every Presbyter*; some of which, if not all, would be found, were they not the same.

But if this *Remonstrant* think to help himselfe by taking Sanctuary in *Antiquity* (though we would gladly rest in Scripture, the Sanctuary of the Lord) yet we will follow him thither, and there shew him that *Hierome* from the Scriptures proves more then once, *Presbyters* and *Bishops* to be the same. And *Chrysostome* in *Philip.* 1. *Homil.* 2. with his admirer *Theophilact* in *Philip.* 1. affirms that while the Apostles lived, the names of *Bishops and Presbyters* were not distinguished: and not onely while the Apostles lived, but in after ages. Doth not *Irenæus* use the name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* ἀδιαφόρως, in a promiscuous sense? Are not *Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, Sixtus,* whom the Papists call Bishops, and the Popes predecessors, termed by *Eusebius* Presbyters? Nor was it strange in the Primitive times to hear Bishops called Presbyters, when Presbyters writing to their Bishop have called him *Frater.* So *Cyprian* (*Epist.* 26. in the beginning) is stiled by his Presbyters, Deacons and Confessors; nor was that holy Martyr offended with that title, nor they condemned of insolency that used it.

*Hierony. Ep. ad Evag. & ad Ocea.*

*Iren. adver. hær. l.* 4. *cap.* 43. 44.

*Hist. Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 23.

But what should we burthen your patience with more testimonies, when the evidence of this truth hath shined with so strong a beam that even our *Adversaries* have stooped to it, and confessed that their *Names* were the same in the Apostles time? But yet say they, the *Offices* were distinct.

*Bellarm. de Cleric. Lib.* 1. *cap.* 15.

Now here we would gladly know, what these men make the distinct Office of a Bishop.

Is it to edifie the Church by Word and Sacrament? is it to ordain others to that work? is it to rule, to govern, by admonition and other censures? if any of these, if all these make up the pro-

pre

per worke of a Bishop; we can prove from Scripture that all these belong unto the Presbytery, which is no more then was granted by a Councel.

a *Presbyteris sicut Episcopis Dispensatio Mysteriorum Dei commissa est: Præsunt enim Ecclesiæ Christi: in Consecratione Dominici corporis & sanguinis, consortes sunt cum Episcopis: & similiter in Doctrina Populorum & in officio prædicandi: ac solum propter autoritatem, summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio reservata est: Concil. Aquisgran. primum, Can. 8.*

*Euangelium tribuit his qui præsunt Ecclesiæ Mandatum docendi Evangeli, remittendi peccata, administrandi Sacramenta: præterea jurisdictionem; videlicet Mandatum Excommunicandi eos quorum notæ sunt crimina, & Resipiscentes rursum absolvendi: Ac Omnium Confessione, etiam adversariorum liquet, hanc potestatem* Jure Divino *communem esse* Omnibus *qui præsunt Ecclesiæ, sive Pastores vocentur, sive Presbyteri, Sive Episcopi. Scriptum* Philip. Melanch. *in conventu Smalcald. Anno.* 1540. *a præcipuis illarum Ecclesiarum Doctoribus communi Consensu comprobatu de potestate & jurisdictione Episcoporum.*

For the first, Edifying of the Church by word and Sacraments, though we feare they will some of them at least scarce own this as *their proper worke* (for some have been cited into the *High Commission* for saying, it belongs to them) yet Sir we are sure, Scripture makes it *a part*, a *chiefe* of the Episcopal office; for so in the 1 Pet. 5. 2. they are said to doe the work of a Bishop, when they do feed the flock of God. And this is such a work as *we* hope their *Lordships* will give the poor Presbyters leave to share with them in: or if not, we will tell them that the Apostle *Peter* in that forecited place, and the Apostle *Paul*, *Acts.* 20. binds this work upon our hands, and *Woe unto us if we preach not the Gospel.* 1 ἐπισκοπεῖν. ποιμαίνειν.

But this branch of Episcopal and Presbyterial office we passe with brevity, because in this there lies not so much controversie as in the next, which they doe more wholly *Impropriate* to themselves: the power of Ordination.

Which power, that it was in former times in the hands of *Presbyters*, appeares 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift which was given thee by Prophesie, and by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* The gift here spoken of is the Ministerial gift, the exercise whereof, the Apostle exhorts *Timothy* not to neglect, which saith he, he had received, not by the laying on of the hands of one single man, whether *Apostle*, or *Bishop*, or *Presbyter*, but τῶ πρεσβυτηρίω the Presbytery, that is, the *whole company* of Presbyters, for in that sense onely we finde τὸ πρεσβυτήριον taken in Scripture, as in *Luke* 22. vers. 66. *Act.* 22. vers. 5. which the Christian Church called the *Ecclesiastical Senate* as *Ierom* in *Isay* 3. *Nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum, Cœtum Presbyterorum*, & an *Apostolical Senate*: συνέδριον Ἀποστόλων *Ignatius Epis. ad Magnes.* and some times πρεσβυτήριον *Concil. Ancyr. Can.* 18. *Jerom. Isa.* 3.

And though the Apostle in his second Epistle to *Tim.* 1. 6. makes mention of the laying on of his hands: yet to maintaine the Harmony of Scripture, it must not be denied but there was imposition of hands by the Presbytery as wel as by himself, and so it was a joynt act; So that in this there is no more difference then in the former. *Igna. Epis. ad Magnes. Conc. Ancyr. Can.* 18.

Aud

And if there be no difference between Presbyters in feeding or ordaining, let us see if there be any in the third part of their office of *Ruling*, which though our *Bishops* assume wholly to themselves, yet we shall discover, that it hath been committed to and exercised by *Presbyteriall* hands.

For who are they of whom the Scripture speakes, *Heb.* 13. 17. *Obey them that have the Rule over you? for they watch for your soules, as they that must give an account, &c.*

Here all such as watch over the souls of Gods people, are intituled *to rule* over them. So that unlesse *Bishops* will say, that they *only watch* over the souls of Gods people, and are *only to give an account* for them, they cannot challenge to themselves the *sole rule* over them. And if the *Bishops* can give us good security, that they will acquit us from *giving up our account to God* for the souls of his people, we will quit our plea, and resigne to them the sole rule over them.

So againe in the 1 *Thessa.* 5. 12. *Know them which labour amongst you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.*

In which words are contained these truthes; First that in one Church (for the *Thessalonions* were but one Church, 1, *Ca.*) there was not ὁ προισταμενος but οἱ προισταμενοι; not *one chiefe Bishop* or *President*, but the *Presidency was in many.*

2. Secondly, that this *Presidency* was of such as laboured in the word and Doctrine.

3. Thirdly, that the Censures of the Church were managed not by one, but by them all in *Communi.* *Them that admonish you.*

4. Fourthly, that there was among them a *Parity*: for the Apostle bids *know them* in an *indifferency*, not discriminating one from another: yea such was the rule that Elders had, that S. *Peter* thought it needful to make an exhortation to them to use their power with *Moderation*, not *Lording it over Gods Heritage*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 3.

By this time we have sufficiently proved from Scripture, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are the same in name, in Office, in Edifying the Church, in power of Ordination and Jurisdiction: we sum up all that hath been spoken in one argument:

They which have the *same Name*, the *same Ordination* to their Office, the *same qualification* for *their Office*, the *same worke* to feed the *flock* of God, to *ordaine pastors* and *Elders*, to *Rule* and *Governe*; they are one and the same Office: but such are *Bishops* and *Presbyters: Ergo.*

## SECT. VI.

*Pag.* 20. BUt the dint of all this *Scripture*, the *Remonstrant* would elude, by obtruding upon his reader *a commentary* (as he calls it) of

the

it seemes they will rather doe then lose this plea for their τυραννικὴν προρομί'α *their tyrannical prerogative*, as *Nazianzen* calls it. *Greg. Nazi. ubi prius.*

Suffer us therefore humbly to appeale to your Honours, whether this Remonstrant hath not given sentence against himself, who is so confident of the Evidence of his cause, that he doth not feare to say, if there can be better *Evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact then there is* for his Episcopacy: Let EPISCOPACY BE FOR EVER ABANDONED OUT OF THE CHURCH OF GOD. *Pag. 22.*

## SECT. VII.

YEt it seems himselfe in the height of his confidence was not without Jelousies, of so ne thing might be spoken against his cause, therefore he seems to heare, what is spoken against it.

*That the Apostles Bishops and ours are two: there was no other then a Parochial Pastor, a Preaching Presbyter without inequallity, without any Rule over his brethren. Ours claime an eminent Superiority, and a power of Ordination and Iurisdiction unknowne to the Primitive times.* *Pag. 23.*

That this which he supposeth he heares us say is Scripture Truth we have shewed already, &c. that there *was a parity between Presbyters and Bishops: and that eminent superiority and power of Ordination and Iurisdiction which our Bishops claime*, was unknown to Scripture: and are now prepared by *Gods assistance* to prove, it was unknown to primitive times.

But how doth this Remonstrant meete with this Reply: ALAS, ALAS, HOW GOOD PEOPLE may be abused by misinformation! It seemes the man Judged this Reply so poor as in his thoughts it was more worthy of his *pitty*, then *of his paines* to answer, or rather knew there was more in this Reply, then he knew how to answer, and therefore waves it with his *Rhetoricke*. *Pag. 23.*

And this we rather think, becaus he knowes but little in *Antiquity*, that knowes not, that there is so vast a difference between our Bishops, and those that were not onely in the Apostles dayes (whom we have proved to be undistinguished from Presbyters) But those Bishops that were in the Church 400. yeares after, when there began to be some discrimination, that *Episcopacy* may well be likened to the Ship *Argo*, that was so often repaired, as there was nothing left of the *First Materials*; yet still it challenged *the first Name*.

Which difference we spread before your Honours in three particulars: first in point of Election to their office; secondly, in point of Execution of their office; thirdly, in point of State-Imployment.

First (having discovered already upon what *occasion* this priority began to have existence in the Church, and from whom it first re-

received its being, not from *God* but from *Consent* and *Custome* of the *Churches*, according to *Ambrose*, *Ierome*, *Augustine*, *&c.*) We come now to Declare what was the manner of Election unto this Priority in these times, and to shew first, how therein these Bishops did differ from ours: for all their Elections were ordered by the privity, consent, and approbation of *the people*, where the *Bishops* was to serve. Were there no other Authors to make this good, *Cyprian* alone would doe it, among other places let his 68. Epistle witnesse, where he saith * *plebs Maxime habet potestatem*, *&c.* The people specially have power either of chusing worthy Priests, or rejecting the unworthy: for this is derived from *Divine Authority*, that the Priests should be chosen in the presence of the people, before all their eyes and approved as fit and worthy by their publike vote and Testimony. This he proves by the Testimony of Sacred writ both Old and New. Where we observe first, that the special power of Judging of the worthinesse or unworthinesse of a man for the Prelacy was in the breast of the Peogle. Secondly, the special power of choosing or rejecting eo his place according as they Judged him worthy or unworthy resided in the People. *Plebs maximè Habet potestatem*, *&c.* Thirdly, that this power did descend upon the People *De Divina Authoritate*.

Nor was this the Judgement of one Sole man, but of an *Affrican* Synod consulted by the Spanish Churches in point of Election, as the inscription of the Epistle shewes.

*a* The Obtrusion of a Bishop upon the Church of *Alexandria* without the Presence, desire and vote of the Clergy or People is condemned by *Athanasius* not onely as a breach of Canon, but as a Transgression of Apostolical prescript, and that it did compel or necessitate the heathen to blaspheme.

Nor did onely *Christian Bishops*, but *Christian Princes* acknowledge the Right and power of Election of Bishops to be in the People, so that *admired Constantine* the great Promover and Patron of the peace of the *Chistian Church* writing to the Church of *Nicomedia* against *Eusebius*, and *Theognius*, tells them the ready way to lay asleep the Tumults that did then disturbe the Church about the Election of a Bishop was, *si modo Episcopum fidelem & integrum nacti fuerint, quod quidem in præsentia in vestrâ situm est potestate, quodque etiam dudùm penes vestrum Iudicium fuerat, nisi Eusebius de quo dixi pravo eorum, qui cum juverunt Consilio hac præceps ruisset & rectum Eligendi Ordinem impudenter conturbasset. Gelas in Act, Concil. Nicen. part.3.* if they would get a faithful and upright Bishop which saith he, is in *your power presently to doe*; and was long agoe, if *Eusebius* with the aide of his faction, had not rushed in upon you, and im-

* *Plebs ipsa Maximè habet potestatem vel Eligendi. Dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi, quod & ipsum Videmus de Divina Authoritate descendere: ut sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque Idoneus publico Iudicio ac testimonio comprobetur.* By Priests the Authour here understands Bishops, as the whole *Series* of the Epistle shews.

a Κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας, καὶ κατὰ τὸ τοῦ παύλου ῥῆμα, —— πάντα κανονικῶς ἐξεταδῆναι τε, καὶ παραχθῆναι, παρόντων τῶν αἰτουμένων λαῶν καὶ κληρικῶν —— τοῦτο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας παραλύσει, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη βλασφημεῖν ἀναγκάζει. *Athanas. Epist. ad Orthodoxos.*

*the Apostles own practise* (which he would force to contradict their own rules) to which he *superadds the unquestionable glosse of the cleare practise of their immediate successors in this administration.* For the Apostles practice, we have already discovered it, from the Apostles own writings; and for his Glosse he superadds, if it corrupts not the Text, we shall admit it; but if it doe, we must answer with *Tertullian*; *Id verum quodcunq; primum: id adulterum quod posterius*, whatsoever is first is true; but that which is latter is adulterous. *Tertul.*

In the examination of this Glosse, to avoyd needlesse Controversie, First, we take for granted by both sides, that the first and best Antiquity, used the *names of Bishops* and *Presbyters* promiscuously. Secondly, that in processe of time, some one was honoured with the name of *Bishop*, and the rest were called *Presbyters* or *Cleri*. Thirdly, that this was not *Nomen inane*, but there was some kinde of Imparity between him and the rest of the Presbyters.

Yet in this we differ; that they say, this *Impropriation* of name, and *Imparity of place, is of Divine Right and Apostolical Institution*: we affirme both to be occasional, and of humane Invention; and undertake to shew out of Antiquity, both the *occasion upon which*, and the *Persons by whom this Imparity* was brought into the Church.

On our parts stands *Jerome* and *Ambrose*, and others, whom we doubt not but our Remonstrant will grant a place among his Glossators: Saint *Jerome* tells us in 1 *Tit.*

*Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus: & antequam Diaboli instinctu, studia in Religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego sum* Pauli, *ego* Apollo, *ego* Cephæ, *Communi Presbyterorũ Consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam verò unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi; in toto Orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ Cura pertineret, & schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non Scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam, Episcopum & Presbyterum unum esse, & aliud ætatis, aliud*

A Presbyter and a Bishop is the same: and before there were through the Devils instinct, divisions in Religion, and the people began to say, I am of *Paul*, and I of *Apollo*, and I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the Common-councell of the Presbyters. But after that each man began to account those whom he had baptized his own, and not Christs; it was decreed thorow the whole world, that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest; to whom the care of all the Church should belong, that the seeds of schisme might be taken away. Thinks any, that this is my opinion, and not the opinion of the Scripture, that a Bishop and an Elder is the same? let him read the words

of

*esse nomen officii, relegat Apostoli ad* Philippenses *verba, dicentis,* Paulus & Timotheus *servi Jesu Christi qui sunt* Philippis, *cum Episcopis & Diaconis, &c.* Philippi *una est urbs* Macedoniæ, *& certè in una Civitate non poterant plures esse* &c.) *ut nuncupantur*) *Episcopi, &c.*

of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, saying, *Paul* and *Timothy*, the servants of Jesus Christ, to them that are at *Philippi*, with the Bishops and Deacons. *Philippi* is one city of *Macedonia*, and certainly in one city there could not be *many Bishops* (as they are now called) and after the allegations of many other Scriptures, he concludes thus; *sicut ergo Presbyteri sciant se ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit esse subjectos; Ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate Presbyteris esse majores, & in Communi debere Ecclesiam regere.*

the Elders therefore may know, that they are to be subject to him that is set over them by the custome of the Church; so let the Bishops know, that it is more from custome, then from any true dispensation from the Lord, that they are above the Presbyters, & that they ought to rule the Church in common.

In which words of *Ierome*, these five things present themselves to the Readers view;

First, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are originally the same; *Idem ergo est Presbyter qui Episcopus.*

Secondly, that that Imparity that was in his time between Bishops and Elders, was grounded upon Ecclesiastical custome, and not upon devine Institution; *Episcopi noverint, &c.*

Thirdly, that this was not his private judgement, but the judgement of Scripture; *Putat aliquis, &c.*

Fourthly, that before this Priority was upon this occasion started, the Church was governed *Communi Presbyterorum Consilio*, by the Counsel of the Presbyters in common, and that even after this imparity, it ought to be so governed; *Sciant Episcopi se Ecclesiam debere in communi regere.*

Fifthly, that the occasion of this Imparity and Superiority of Bishops above Elders, was the divisions which through the Devils instinct fell among the Churches; *Postquam verò Diaboli instinctu.*

*Saravia* would take advantage of this place, to deduce this Imparity as high as from the Apostles times, because even then they began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos*: but sure S. *Ierome* was not so weake as this man would make him, to speak Inconsistencies; and when *he propounds* it to himself, to prove that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are in *Scripture* the same, to let fall words that should confute his own proposition; whereas therefore S. *Ierome* saith, that

*after*

*after men began to say, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, &c. it was decreed that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest, &c.* This is spoken indeed in the *Apostles phrase*, but *not of the Apostles times*, else to what purpose, is that coacervation of texts that followes?

But suppose it should be granted to be of Apostolical antiquity (which yet we grant not, having proved the contrary) yet it appeares, it was not of *Apostolical intention*, but of *Diabolical occasion*: And though the Devil by kindling Divisions in the Church, did minister *Occasion* to the invention of the primacy or prelacy or one for the suppressing of Schisme; yet there is just cause to think, that the Spirit of God in his Apostles was never the author of this invention.

First, because we read in the Apostles dayes there were Divisions, *Rom.* 16.7. and Schismes, 1 *Cor.* 3.3. and 11. 18. yet the Apostle was not directed by the holy Ghost to ordaine Bishops for the taking away of those Divisions. Neither in the rules he prescribes for the healing of those breaches, doth he mention *Bishops* for that end: Nor in the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Titus* for the *Ordination of Bishops or Elders*, doth he mention this as one end of their *Ordination*, or *one peculiar duty of their office*. And though the Apostle saith, *Oportet hæreses inter vos esse, ut qui probati sunt manifesti fiant inter vos*; yet the Apostle no where saith, *Oportet Episcopos esse, ut tollantur hæreses, quæ manifestæ fiunt.* 1

Secondly, because as Doctor *Whitaker* saith, the remedy devised hath proved worse then the disease, which doth never happen to that remedy whereof the holy Ghost is the author. 2

Thirdly, because the holy Ghost, who could foresee what would ensue thereupon, would never ordaine that for a remedy, which would not onely be ineffectual to the cutting off of evil, but become a stirrup for Antichrist to get into his saddle. For if there be a necessity of setting up one *Bishop* over many *Presbyters* for preventing schismes, there is as great a necessity of setting up one *Archbishop over many Bishops*, and one *Patriarch over many Archbishops*, and one *Pope over all*, unlesse men will imagine, that there is a danger of schisme onely among *Presbyters*, and not among *Bishops and Archbishops*, which is contrary to *reason, truth, History*, and our own *Experience*.

And lest our adversaries should appeale from *Hierome* as an incompetent Judge in this case, because a Presbyter, and so a party, we will therefore subjoyne the jndgments of other ancient Fathers who were themselves Bishops.

The Commentaries that go under the name of Saint *Ambrose* upon *Ephes.* 4. mention another occasion of this Discrimination or

priority; and that was * the increase and dilatation of the Church upon occasion whereof they did ordaine Rectors or Governours, and other officers in the Church; yet this he grants, that this did differ from the former orders of the Church, and from apostolical Writ.

*At ubi omnia Loca Circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula constituta sunt: & cæperunt Rectores: & Cætera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata. Cæpit aliter ordine & Providentia gubernari Ecclesia. Ideo non per omnia inveniunt Scripta Apostoli ordinationi quæ nunc in Ecclesia est, quia hæc inter ipsa primordia scripta sunt. Nam & Timotheum à se Presbyterium Creatum Episcopum vocat, &c. Sed quia cæperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inventri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, &c.*

And this Rectorship or Priority was devolved at first from one Elder to another by Succession, when he who was in the place was removed, the next in order among the Elders Succeeded. But this was afterwards changed, and that unworthy men might not be preferred, it was made a matter of Election, and not a matter of Succession. Thus much we finde concerning the occasion of this imparity, enough to shew, it is not of Divine Authority.

For the second thing, the persons who brought in this Imparity: the same Authors tells us, the Presbyters themselves brought it in; witnesse *Hierome ad Evag. Alexandriæ Presbyteri unum ex se electum in Excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret, aut Diaconi de se Archidiaconum.* The Presbyters of *Alexandria* did call him their *Bishop*, whom they had chosen from among *themselves*, & placed in a higher degree; as if an army should make an Emperour, or the Deacons an Archdeacon.

*Hierom ad Evag.*

*Ambrose* upon the fourth of the *Ephesians* tells us, it was done by *a Councell*, and although he neither name the time nor place of the *Councel*, yet ascribing it to a *Councell* he grants it not to be Apostolical: this gave occasion to others to fixe it upon Custome as *Hieronym*, in *Tit.* and *August. Epist. 19. secundum honorum vocabula quæ Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit Episcopatus Presbyterio major est*, And had that πρωτοθρονία or Prelacy had the Seal and confirmation of *Divine* or *Apostolical Authority*, *Gregory Nazianzene* would never in such a Pathetick manner have wished the Abolition of it, as he doth in his 28. Oration.

*Ambros. ubi prius.*

*Grego. Naz. Orat. 28.*

*Pag. 21, 22.* And now *where is that acknowledgement, and conveyance of Imparity and Iurisdiction which* saith this Remonstrant *was derived from the Apostles hands, and deduced in an uninterupted line, unto this day: where is it?* we finde no such *Imparity delivered from Apostolical hands*, nor *acknowledged* in Apostolical writings; yet had there *been such an acknowledgement and conveyance of imparity*: how this should have been deduced to us in an uninterrupted Line, we know not, unlesse our *Bishops* will draw the Line of *their Pedigree* through the *loynes of Antichrist*, and *joyne issue*, and *mingle blood with Rome*: which

it

nation, seem to imply, that that power is soly theirs: Here wee desire it may be observed.

First, that these Fathers put all the difference that lies betweene Bishops and Presbyters, to be in point of Ordination. *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter exceptâ Ordinatione.* And therefore *Chrysostome* himselfe confesseth, that in his days there was litle or no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter. *Inter Episcopum & presbyterum interest fermè nihil, &c.* *Chrysost.* upon the 1. *Tim.*

Secondly, That this difference is not so to he understood, as if these Fathers did hold it to be by divine right (as *Bellarmin* and our Episcopal men would make us beleeve) but by a humane constitution. And therefore they do not speak *De jure* but *de facto*, *Quid facit, &c.* not *quid debet facere.* And this *Hierom* confesseth. So *Leo prim. ep.* 88. upon complaints of unlawful Ordinations, writing to the Germane and French Bishops, reckons up what things are reserved to the Bishops, among which he set down *Presbyterorum & Diaconorum consecratio*, and then addes, *Quæ omnia solis deberi summis Pontificibus Authoritate Canonum præcipitur:* So that for this power of Ordination, they are more beholden to the Canon of the Church, then to the Canon of Gods Word. *Libro de septem Ordinibus.* *Concil. Aquisgra. 1. Can. 8. Solum propter authoritatem Clericorum ordinatio & consecratio reservata est summo Sacerdoti.*

Thirdly, we answer that this very humane difference was not in the Primitive Antiquity. It was not so in *Cyprians* time, as we even now shewed. And when it did prevaile, it was but a particular custome (and sometimes usurpation) of some Churches. For it was otherwise appointed in the Councel of Carthage, and in Egypt, and other places, as is declared in the former part of this Section; and even in *Chrysostomes* time, it was so little approved of, that it was one great accusation against *Chrysostome* himselfe, *That he made Ordinations without the Presbytery, and without the consent of his Clergy*, this is quoted by Bishop *Downam, lib. 1. cap. 8. pag.* 176.

## SECT. IX.

*Bilson. Spalat Franc. à Sancta Clara.*

NOr had the Bishops of former times more right to the power of *sole Jurisdiction*, then of *sole Ordination:* And here we have *Confitentem reum*, our very Adversaries confess the Votes of Antiquity are with us. *Cyp. Epist. 6. & 28.*

*Cyprian* professeth, that *he would do nothing without the Clergy*; nay, *he could do nothing without them*; nay, *he durst not take upon him alone* to determine that which of right did belong to all; and had he or any other done so, the fourth Councel of Carthage condemns the Sentence of the Bishop, as *Irrita nisi Clericorum sententiâ confirmetur.* 18. *Concil. 4. Carthag. Can. 23. Vid Ruff. Hist. lib. 10. cap. 9. Sozo. l. 2. c. 23. Possidon. de vita. Aug. c. 4.*

Would ye know the particulars, wherein the Bishops had no power of Judicature without their Presbyters. First *Orig. Hom. 11. in Exo. pag.* 97.

1 Decret. part. 2. Can. 15. quæ. 7. Per totum & partes Dist. 93. cap. 5, 6.

First, in judging and censuring Presbyters themselves, and their Doctrine; For this the Canon Law in *Gratian* is full and cleare: *Episcopus non potest Iudicare Presbyterum vel Diaconum sine Synodo & Senioribus*: Thus *Basil* counselled and practised, *epist.* 75. So *Ambr. lib.* 10. *epist.* 80. *Cyril in epist. ad Iohannem Antiochen.* Thus *Gregory ad Iohan. Panor mitan. lib.* 11. *epist.* 49.

2 Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. 7.

Secondly, in judging of the conversation or crimes of any of the members of the Church: *Penes Presbyteros est Disciplina quæ facit homines meliores*; That Discipline that workes *emendation* in men, is in the power of the *Elders*. And therefore when any was questioned in point of conversation, he was brought, saith *Tertullian*, into the *Congregation* where were *Exhortations*, *Castigations*, and *Divine censures*: And who had the chiefe stroke in these Censures, he tells us after: *President probati quique seniores: All the approved Elders sit as Presidents.*

Tertul. Apol. adver. Gent.

And those censures that passed by the whole Presbytery were more approved by the *Church* in ancient times, then such as were passed by one man; for we finde that when *Syagrius* and *Ambrose* passed Sentence in the same case, the *Church* was unsatisfied in the Sentence of *Syagrius*, because he past it *sine alicujus fratris consilio*, without the counsel or consent of any of his *Brethren*. But were pacified with the sentence of Saint *Ambrose*: becaus, saith he, *Hoc Iudicium Nostrum cum fratribus & consacerdotibus participatum processerit.*

Ambros. Epist. ad Syagrium.

Nor was there any kinde of censures that the Bishops did administer alone: Admonitions were given by the *Elders*; *Augustine* tells us the Elders did admonish such as were offenders; to the same purpose speakes. *Origen. contra Celsum. Lib.* 3.

Aug. de verb. Apost. Ser. 19.

[a] *Constat. Iurisdictionem illam excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ideo nnes Pastores, hanc ad se solos tyrannicè transtulerunt, & ad quæstum contulerunt Episcopi, Melanc. ubi sup.*

* So excommunication, though that being the dreadfullest thunder of the Church, and as *Tertullian* calls it, *summum præjudicium futuri Iudicij*, the great fore-runner of the Judgement of God, was never vibrated but by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine: yet was no one man in the Church invested with this power more then another.

[b] *Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodor. Ep. ad Demet.*

Therefore saith [b] *Hierom*; *Presbytero si peccavero licet me tradere Satanæ in interitum carnis.* If I sinne, a Presbyter (not a Bishop only) may deliver me to Satan, to the destruction, &c. where the Reader may please to take notice that Saint *Hierom* speakes not of one particular Presbyter, but of the Order of *Presbyters*.

The same S. *Hierom* saith againe, *Sunt quos Ecclesia reprehendit, quos interdum abijcit, in quos non nunquam Episcoporum & Clericorum censura desævit.* There be some whom the Church reproves, and some which she casts out; against whom the censures of *Bishops and Presbyters* sharply proceed; where we see, the Censures whereby wicked

wicked men were cast out of the Church, were not in the sole hands of the Bishops, but likewise in the hands of Presbyters.

*Syricius* Bishop of *Rome* signifies to the Church of *Millaine*, that *Iovinianus*, *Auxentius*, *&c.* were cast out of the Church for ever, and he sets down how they did it, *Omnium Nostrum tam Presbyterorum quam Diaconorum, quam totius etiam cleri scisitata fuit sententia.* There was a concurrence of all Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole Clergy in that sentence of Excommunication. *Ambros. lib. 10. Epist. 80.*

The truth herein may be further evidenced by this, because the whole Clergy as well as the Bishops imposed hands upon such, as repenting were absolved: *Nec ad communicationem (saith Cyprian) venire quis possit, nisi prius ab Episcopo & Clero Manus illi fuerit imposita: No man that hath been excommunicated might returne to Church-Communion, before hands had been laid upon him by the Bishop and Clergy.* *Cypr. Epist. 12.* And this was the custome, saith *Cyprian* in *minoribus delictis.*

*Also writing to his Clergy concerning lapsed Christians*, he tells them, *Exomologesi facta & manu eis à vobis in pœnitentiam impositâ, &c.* that after confession and the *laying on their hands*, they might be commended unto God: so when certaine returning from their heresie were to be received into the Church at *Rome* in the time of *Cornelius*, they came before the *Presbytery*, and therefore confessed their sinnes, and so were admitted. *Cypr. Epist. 46. vide etiam Cypr Epist. 6.*

But though the sentence of Excommunication was managed onely by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine, yet we will not conceale from you, that neither Excommunication not absolution did passe without the *knowledge and approbation* of the body of the Church, to which the Delinquent did belong.

So we have learned out of *Tertullian*, that their censures were ordered in their publike assemblies; and good reason, because the people were to forbeare communion with such. 2 *Thes.* 3.6, 14, 15. and publike censures of the Church were inflicted not onely for the Emendation of delinquents, but for the admonition of others, and therefore ought to be administred in publike that others might feare, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. *Origen* speaking of the Duty and Power of the Church in cutting off a scandalous Person though a Presbyter, making the case his own, he saith thus: *In uno consensu Ecclesia universa conspirans excidat me dextram suam & projiciat a se, He would have the consent of the whole Church in that Act.* *Tertul. Apol. adver. Gent. cap. 59.* *Origen. Ham. 7. in Josh.*

And when the lapsed Christians were received againe into the Church, the Peoples consent was required therein; else why should *Cyprian* say, *Vix plebi persuadeo imò extorqueo ut tales patiantur admitti:* I can scarce perswade the people to suffer such to be admitted: and in another Epistle written to his people in his Banishment, he promiseth to examine all things, they being present and judging. *Examinabuntur singula præsentibus & judicantibus vobis.* *Cypr. Epist. 55.* *Cypr. Epist 11. ad plebem.*

But of this power of the People we shall have a further occasion to

ſpeak afterwards, when we come to diſcourſe of *Governing Elders*.

Onely may it pleaſe your Honours from hence to take notice, how unjuſtly our Biſhops have invaded this right and power of Presbyters and people in Church cenſures, and deveſting both of it, have girt it wholly upon themſelves, and how herein they and the Biſhops of former times are TWO.

## SECT. X.

AND as our Biſhops, and the Biſhops of former times are TWO in point of *Sole Juriſdiction*, ſo alſo in the *Delegation* of this power of *Juriſdiction* unto others: to their Chancellours, Commiſſaries, Officers, &c. Was ever ſuch a thing as this heard of in the beſt primitive Times? that *men that never received impoſition of hands*, ſhould not only be received into aſſiſtance, but be *wholly intruſted with the power of Spiritual Juriſdiction*: Even then when it is to be exerciſed over *ſuch perſons as have had hands laid upon them.*

*Indecorũ ſt Laicum icarium ſe Epiſco-, & ſe-ulares in Eccleſiâ udicare: in no enim odemque pere non ecet diſpar rofeſſio uod etiam n lege Di-ina pro-ibetur di-ente Mo-e, Non ara-bis in bove & aſino ſimul, Con-cil. Hiſpal. 2.*

We may obſerve in *Cyprian*, whilſt perſecution ſeparated him from his Church, when queſtions did ariſe among his people, he doth not ſend them to his Chancellour or Commiſſary; No, he was ſo far from ſubſtituting any man (much leſſe a *lay man*) to determene or give Judgement in ſuch caſes, that he would not aſſume that power wholly to himſelf, but ſuſpends his Judgement, till the hand of God ſhould reſtore him to his Church againe, that with the advice and Counſel of the Presbyters, he might give ſentence: as may appeare to any that ſhall peruſe his Epiſtles.

Sure if God had ever led his Church to ſuch a way of deputation, it would have been in ſuch a caſe of Neceſſity as this was: or had any footſteps of ſuch a courſe as this been viſible by this holy Martyr in the goings of former ages, he needed not have deferred the determination of the queſtion about the receiving of ſome penitent lapſed ones into the boſome of the Church again, till his returne and the returne of his Clergy, as he doth.

*Cypr. Epiſt 28.*

We will inſtance in his 28 Epiſtle, wherein giving direction for the excommunicating of ſuch as would raſhly communicate with lapſed Chriſtians, he gives this charge not to his *Chancellor or Commiſſary*, or any other man upon whom he had devolved his power, and ſet him as his *Deputy or Viccar generall* in his abſence, but *ad clerum*, to the whole Presbytery.

*Downham in the defence of his Sermon, lib. 1 cap. 8.*

This Truth is ſo cleare, that Biſhop *Downam* the great Advocate of Epiſcopacy confeſſeth, that in *Ambroſe* his time, and a good while after (which was about 400 years) till the Presbyters were in a manner wholly neglected, the Biſhops had no *Ordinaries*, *Vicars*, *Chancellors*, or *Commiſſaries*, that were not *Clergy-men*: but this is but a *blind*, wherewith the Biſhop would Dorre his Reader, for we challenge any man to produce the names of any *Clergy-man* that was Vicar to *Ambroſe*, or Chancellor to *Auguſtine*, or any other of the Biſhops of theſe times; ſo

impudently disturbed the *right Order of Election.*

That which this sacred Emperour calls the *right order of Election*, what is it but the Election by the people? in whose power, he saith it then was and long had been to choose a *Bishop*; and by whose power the next *Bishop* was chosen. So the same Author tells us, that after *Eusebius* and *Theognius* were cast out of their several seats for *Arianisme*, by the Councel of *Nice*, others were appointed in their roomes by the *Clergy and people* of each Dioceſſe. *Idem ubi supra.*

To this Election in *Nicomedia*, we could (if it were needful in so cleare a Truth) adde many the like Presidents of popular Elections; which for brevities sake, we passe over. Not questioning, but that which hath been spoken, is sufficient to informe the intelligent Reader, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times, are TWO *in point of Election.* *Cyprian, Cornelius, Athanasius* and others.

## SECT. VIII.

A Second thing wherein we have undertaken to *shew*, that our *Bishops* and the *Bishops* of former times are TWO, is in the Execution of their Office: and here there are three things, wherein he that will not *wilfully shut his eyes against all light*, may see a Latitude of *difference* between ours and former Bishops. First, in that *Sole Iurisdiction* which our Bishops assume to themselves. Secondly, in the *Delagation* they make of the *power of exercising* this Jurisdiction unto others. Thirdly, in the *way of the exercise of that power.*

For the first of these, *Their sole Iurisdiction*; That our *Bishops* assume this to themselves, it is *known* and *felt*, and that this *Sole Iurisdiction* was a *stranger*, a *Monster* to former times, we shall now prove, and make cleare; that the power of *Ordination*, *Admonition*, *Excommunication*, *Absolution*, was not in the hands of any sole man.

First, for *Ordination*, *Cyprian* in his exile writing to his Charge, certifies them, that *Aurelius was ordained by him and his Colleagues, who were present with him*; (who were these Colleagues, but his Presbyters; as he himself expounds it, writing to *Lucius* in his own name, and the name of his Clergy and people, *Ego & Collegæ & fraternitas omnis, &c.* I and my Colleagues and my whole people send these Letters to you, &c. So that it is cleare in *Cyprians* time, *Presbyters* had a hand in *Ordination*, and *Bishops* did not Ordaine alone. *Firmilianus* saith of them that rule in the Church, *Quod baptizandi, MANUM IMPONENDI ET ORDINANDI, possident potestatem.* And who those he, he expresseth a little before, *SENIORES & Præpositi*: by whom the *Presbyters* as well as the *Bishops* are understood. *Cypr. Epist. 33.* *Epist. 38.* *Apud Cypr. Epist. 75.*

And

And as these places prove, that Bishops in the Primitive time, could not ordain alone without the Presbyters; so there are that give us light to understand, that the Presbyters might ordain without the Bishop. The Author of the Comment upon the *Ephesians*, that goes under the name of of *Ambrose*, saith, *Apud Egyptum Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus, In Egypt the Presbyters ordain, if the Bishop be not present*; so saith *Augustine* in the same words; and the * Corepiscopus, who was but a Presbyter, had power to impose hands, and to ordaine within his precincts, with the Bishops Licence. Now Licences confer not a power to him that hath it not, but onely a faculty to exercise that power he hath.

*Cum jure Divino non sint diversi gradus Episcopi & Pastores: Manifestum est ordinationem in suâ Ecclesiâ factam JURE DIVINO RATAM esse. Itaque cum Episcopi ordinarii fiant hostes Ecclesiæ aut nolunt ordinationem impertire, Ecclesia retinet jus suum. Melanch. ubi supra, pag. Concil. Antios. Can. 10. & Ancyr. Can. 13.*

The iniquity of our times hath been such, that a Minister may not Preach to his own flock, without a Licence: doth this Licence make a man a Minister, and give him power to preach, or only a faculty and liberty to exercise that power? Should a Bishop give a Laike a Licence to preach, or to ordain, doth that Licence make him a Minister, or a Bishop? Sure all will say, no: why? because in the Laike there is not *Actus primus*, the root and principle of that power, which Licence onely opens a way to the exercise of; and therefore that must be concluded to be in those Chorepiscopi; or Presbyters, by vertue of their place and calling, and not by vertue of a Licence. So that the power of *Ordination* was so farre from residing in the Bishop alone, as that the Presbyters and Corepiscopi had power to ordain as well as he.

Neither was this onely a matter of *Ecclesiastical custome*, but of *Ecclesiastical constitution*, which bids the Bishop;

*Concil. 4. Carthag. Can. 22.*

First, in all his Ordinations to consult with his Clergy; *Ut Episcopus sine Concilio Clericorum suorum Clericos non ordinet: That the Bishop shall not ordain a Clergy man without the counsel of the Clergy*: this was *Cyprians* practice, *Epist.* 33.

2. *Ibid. Can.* 3.

Secondly, in his Ordinations to take the concurrent assistance of his Presbyters; *Cum ordinatur Presbyter, Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput eius tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant.* When a Presbyter is ordained, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters that are present, shall likewise lay their hands upon his head, with the hands of the Bishop. In which Canon, we have the unanimous vote of two hundred and fourteen Bishops, declaring that the power of *Ordination* is in the hands of Presbyters as well as Bishops.

*Hieronym. in Epist. ad Evag. Chrysost. Hom. 11. in 1. ad Tim.*

And whereas it may be objected, that *Hierome* and *Chrysostome*, affirming Bishops to differ from Presbyters in the power of Ordination,

## SECT. XI.

A Third branch wherein the difference between our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times, in point of Exercising their Jurisdiction, is visible, is the *way* or *manner* of exercising that power.

For brevities sake we will onely instance in their proceedings in causes criminal; where let them tell us, whether any good *Antiquity* can yeild them one President for THEIR OATH EX OFFICIO, which hath been to their COURTS, as *Purgatory fire to the Popes Kitchin*: they have forgotten that old Maxime in the Civil Law, *Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum*, which as it is grounded upon natural equity, so it is confirmed by a Law enacted by *Diocletian* and *Maximilian*, *Nimis grave est quod petitis, &c. It is too grievous that the adverse part should be required to the exhibition of such things as should create trouble to themselves. Understand therefore that you ought to bring proofes of your intentions, and not to extort them from your adversaries against themselves.* Cod. li. 4. Tit. 20. l. 7.

Shall the Lamp of Nature in the night of Ethnicisme enable Heathen Princes, (yea Persecutors) to see and enact thus much, and shall not the glorious Sunne of the Gospel convince these of their iniquities in transgressing this Law, that call themselves *the Fathers of the Church?*

If neither the *light of Nature*, nor *Gospel light* can, yet the custome of the Church, to which they so oft appeal, may both convince them of this iniquity, and discovr to all the world the contrariety of their proceedings, to the proceedings of former times, in this particular.

For *of Old*, both the Plantiffe and Defendant were brought face to face, before the parties, in whose power it was to judge: which way of proceeding, *Athanasius* affirmes to be according to Scripture, the Law of God. And because those that condemned *Macarius*, did not thus proceed, he condemnes their Sentence as malicious and unjust. Athan. Apol. 2.

*Of old*, no Sentence passed against any man, but upon the Testimony of other witnesses besides the Accusers: after complaint exhibited, the first thing they applyed themselves to, was to consider the person and quality of the *Accuser*, *Concil. prim. Constant. Can.* 6 Then they heard the *witnesses*, who were two at least, *Can. Apost. Can.* 75. And these *witnesses* must be such, as might not be imagined to be *partial*, nor to beare enmity nor malice against the party accused. *Ambros. Epist.* 64. so *Gratian*, *Caus.* 3. *quæ.* 5. *cap. Quod suspecti.* Apud Zonaram.

*Of old*, None might be *party*, *witnesse*, and *Judge*, which *Gratian* proves at large. *Caus.* 4. *qu.* 4. *cap. Nullus unquam præsumat accusator simul esse, & Judex & testis,* Greg. Decreet. lib. 3. Tit. 2. cap. 8. quâ vos. Decret.

We grant indeed the *Canon Law* permits in some cases Tryal without *witnesses*; *Si crimen ita publicum est, ut meritò debeat appellari notorium*; If the crime be so publike, that it may deservedly be called *Notorious*. Which Law further determines what is notorious, saying, *Offensam illam nos intelligimus manifestam, quæ vel per confessionem vel probationem* Greg. lib. 5 Tit. 4. cap. 24.

*bationem legitime nota fuerit, aut evidentiâ Rei, quæ nulla possit tergiversatione celari*; We count that offence manifest, which either by confession, or by lawful proofe comes to be known, or by evidence of fact, so as it can be hid by no tergiversations.

So that all was done in former times with mature deliberation, upon examination and evidence produced, and proved by such witnesses, as against whom the Defendant could lay in no just exception. And not as now an Accusation whispered against a man, he knowes not by whom, to which he must take his oath to answer, before he knows what his Accusation is. Which Oath, if he takes, without further witnesse, he is censured upon the witnesse of his own Oath. If he takes it not, he is sent presently to prison, there to lye without Bayle or Mainprize, till the insupportable miseries of his long durance, compel him to take on Oath against Nature, Scripture, Conscience, and the just Defence of his own innocency.

That our Bishops therefore and former Bishops are *Two*, in the point of executing their Judicatory power, we need spend no more time to prove. But come to the third thing, in which the difference betweene ours and former Bishops is to be evidenced.

## SECT. XII.

AND that is State Imployment, or attendance upon Civil and Secular affaires, &c. which both Christ and Saint *Paul* prohibits, which prohibition reacheth every Bishop (to speake in *Chrysostomes* words) as well as *Timothy*, to whom it is directed; *Nullus ergo Episcopatu præditus hæc audire detrectet, sed agere ea omnia detrectet*, Let no man that is a Bishop, refuse to hear what the Apostle saith, but to doe what the Apostle forbids.

*Chrysost: Hom. 40. in 2. Tim*

We deny not but that Bishops were in the Primitive times often incumbred with secular business: but these were put upon them, sometimes by Emperors, who sought the ruine of the Church, as *Julian*, of whom *Niceph. lib.* 10. *cap.* 13. doth report, that in *Clerum coaptatos Senatorum munere & ministerio perverse fungi jussit.* Sometimes the gracious disposition of Princes toward Christian Religion, made them thus to honour Bishops, thinking thereby to advance Religion: as *Constantine* the Great enacted, that such as were to be tryed before Civil Magistrates, might have leave to appeale *ad Iudicium Episcoporum, atque eorum sententiam ratam esse tanquam ab ipso Imperatore prolatum*, And this the Historian reckoneth as one argument of his reverend respect to Religion. Sometimes the excellency of their singular parts cast civil dignities upon them. *Tiberius* granted a Questors *dignity unto a Bishop for his eloquence: Chrysostome* for his notable stoutness and freedome of speech, was sent as the fittest man to *Gainas*, with the Emperors command. Sometimes the people observing the Bishops to be much honoured by the Emperour, would sollicit them to present their greivances

Recording this among those things that he did *Dolo modo ducere*, κακοτεχνίας, *Sozo.* 1. 9. *Nicep.* 18. 5.

vances to the Emperour. And sometimes the aspiring humour of the Bishops raised them to such places, as appears by *Cyrill*, who was the first Bishop in *Alexandria*, who had civil dignities conferred upon him, as *Socrates* relates it, from whom civil authority did descend upon succeeding Bishops. ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ Αλεξανδρείας πρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως καταδυναστεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν: of whom *Nicephorus* therefore recorded, *Episcopatum majoricum fastu, prophanorum Magistratuum more, quam prædecessores ejus Episcopi, ingressus est, unde adeo initium sumptum est in Ecclesia Alexandrina ut Episcopi etiam, profana negotia curarent:* He entred upon his Episcopacy with more pomp then his predecessors, with a pomp conformable to the Heathen Magistrates. *Socra. 7. 7.* *Lib. 14. c. 14.*

Both these Historians relate the sad consequence that followed upon this, that *Orestes* the *Roman Governour* seeing his power much weakened by the Bishops interposing in secular affairs, hated the Bishop: and this (as the Historian calls it) his *usurped power*. *Soc. l. 7. c. 19.*

This president of the Alexandrian Bishop, the Bishop of Rome did soon follow; *Et Romanus Episcopatus non aliter quam Alexandrinus, quasi EXTRA SACERDOTII FINES egressus ad secularem principatum erat jam delapsus*; The Bishop of Rome as well as the Bishop of Alexandria breaking the limits of the Priestly function, did degenerate into a secular Principality: which purchased no lesse envie to him then that to the other. *Niceph. l.*

And though these two Bishops went at first abreast in this point, yet in a short time the Roman had out stripped the Alexandrian in that power, till the Church degenerating more and more, that Roman Priest advanced his power not onely above all the Bishops, but all the Monarchs in the Christian Orbe.

Yet notwithstanding, he that shall look into the Ancients, shall finde; first, that the best of them held, that they were not to be molested with the handling of worldly affaires, *Cyprian Epist. 66. 1. Singuli divino Sacerdotio honorati non nisi altari & sacrificiis deservire & precibus atq; orationibus vacare debent, Molestiis secularibus non sunt obligandi, qui divinis rebus & spiritualibus occupantur.* 1

Secondly, that they complained of them as of heavy burthens, *Aug.* calls it *Angaria*, yea *Austin* himselfe in his 81. Epistle complaines, that worldly business hindered his praying and so pressed him, that *vix respirare potuit:* and *Gregory* the great, *non sine dolore in secularibus versabatur, præfat. in Dial.* *Possidon. in vini August.*

Thirdly, *Cyprian* construed it as one great cause of persecutions raised against the *Church, de lapsis, Sect. 4.*

Fourthly, it was much cryed down as unlawful by the holy Fathers, many Canons forbidding it, and that under pain of being removed from their places. *Can. Apost. Can. 6. Can. 81.* hee that did presume to administer Ρωμαικὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἱερατικὴν διόκησιν, a Roman com-

command or Administration of Military affaires or civil place (as *Zonaras* there) he should be deposed, *Can. Apo. Can.* 83. hiring of ground, medling with worldly affaires is to be laid aside by them. Otherwise they are threatned to be liable to Ecclesiastical censures, *Conc. Cal. Can.* 3. *Conc. Carth. Can.* 16.

We will adde this for a conclusion in this point, it is observed by *Athanasius*, *Sulpitius*, *Severus*, and other Ecclesiastical Historians, that the *Arians* were very expedite in worldly affaires, which experience they gained by their constant following and attendance upon the Emperours Court; and what troubles they occasioned to the Church thereby, is notoriously known to any that have seen the Histories of their times. And in this our Bishops have approved themselves more like to the *Arian* Bishops *then the purer Bishops of purer times*: but how ever cleare it is, *that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are Two: Two in election to their office; Two in the discharge of their office; Two in their Ordination, Jurisdiction, Processes, Censures, Administrations*; and the difference *between our Bishops and those of former times, is greater then between the great Bishop of Rome and them.*

## SECT. XIII.

But it seemes our Remonstrant soared above these times even as high as the Apostles dayes, for so he saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other spiritual power, then was by Apostolike Authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus*, and the *Angels* of the seven *Asian Churches*, let them be *DISCLAIMED* as *USURPERS*. And the truth is, so they deserve to be, if they doe but challenge the *same power* that the Apostle did delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus*; for *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, and so moved in a *Sphere* above Bishops or Presbyters. For *Timothy*, it is cleare from the letter of the Text, 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ: *Doe the work of an Evangelist*: if *Timothy* had been but a *Presbyter* or *Bishop*, *Paul* had here put him upon imployment, *Ultra Sphæram Activitatis.*

a Let the Reader please to consult *Euseb. Hist lib.* 3: *cap.* 33. according to some, after others *cap.* 37. and view the desc n, he there makes of an Evangelist, and then judg of what we speak.

And to any man, that will but understand and consider what the Office of an * *Evangelist was*; and wherein it differed from the Office of a *Presbyter* or *Bishop*, it will be manifest that *Timothy* and *Titus* were *Evangelists*, and no *Bishops*: for the title of *Evangelist* is taken but two wayes; either for such as *wrote the Gospel*, and so we doe not affirme *Timothy* and *Titus*, to be Evangelists: or else for such as *taught the Gospel*; and those were of two sorts, either such as had *ordinary places and ordinary gifts*, or such whose *places and gifts* were *extraordinary*; and such *Evangelists* were *Timothy* and *Titus*, and not *Bishops*, as will appeare if we consider, what was the *Difference* between the *Evangelists* and *Bishops*. *Bishops* or *Presbyters* were tyed to the particular care and tuition of that flock over which God had made them *Overseers*, *Acts* 20. 28. But *Evangelists* were not *tyed* to reside in *one particular place*, but did attend

tend upon the *Apoſtles* by whoſe appointment they are ſent from place to place, as the neceſſity of the Churches did require. As appeares firſt in *Timothy* whom Saint *Paul* beſought to abide at *Epheſus*, 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. which had beene needleſſe importuniy, if *Timothy* had the *Epiſcopall* ( that is the Paſtorall ) charge of *Epheſus* committed to him by the Apoſtles, for then he might have laid as dreadful a Charge upon him to abide at *Epheſus*, as he doth to Preach the Goſpel. But ſo far was *Paul* from ſetling *Timothy in Cathedrâ* in *Epheſus*, that he rather continually ſends him up and down upon all Church-ſervices, for we finde *Acts.* 17. 14. that when *Paul* fled from the tumults of *Berea* to *Athens*, he left *Silas* and *Timothy* behinde him, who afterwards comming to *Paul* to *Athens*, *Paul* ſends *Timothy* from *Athens* to *Theſſalonica*, to confirm the *Theſſalonians* in the faith, as appears 1 *Theſ.* 3. 1. 2. from whence returning to *Paul* to *Athens* again, the Apoſtle *Paul* before he left *Athens* and went to *Corinth*, ſent him and *Silas* into *Macedonia*, who returned to him again to *Corinth*, *Act.* 18. 5. afterwards they travelled to *Epheſus*, from whence we read *Paul* ſent *Timothy* and *Eraſtus* into *Macedonia*, *Act.* 19. 22. wither *Paul* went after them, and from whence they and divers other Breathren journied into *Aſia*, *Acts* 20. 4. All which Breathren *Paul* calls, as it is probable, Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, the meſſengers of the Churches, 2. *Cor.* 8. 23. And being thus accompanied with *Timothy*, and the reſt of the Bretheren he comes to *Miletum*, and calls the *Elders* of the Church of *Epheſus* thither to him, of which Church had *Timothy* been Biſhop, the Apoſtle in ſtead of giving the Elders a charge to feed the flock of Chriſt, would have given that charge to *Timothy*, and not to them.

*Anno* *Aerae* *Chriſti* *receptae* 47. *Anno* 48 *Anno* 51 *Anno* 53 *Anno* 53

And ſecondly, the Apoſtle would not ſo have forgotten himſelf, as to call the *Elders* Ἐπισκόπους, before their Biſhops face.

Thirdly, It is to be conceived, the Apoſtles would have given them ſome directions, how to carry themſelves towards their Biſhop; but not a word of this though *Timothy* were then in *Pauls* preſence, and in the preſence of the *Elders*. The cleare evidence of which Text *demonſtrates*, that *Paul* did not leave *Timothy* at this time as *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*. But it is rather *evident* that he took him along with him in his journey to *Hieruſalem*, and ſo to *Rome*; for we find that thoſe *Epiſtles Paul* wrote while he a priſoner, bear either in their inſcription or ſome other paſſage of them, the name of *Timothy* as *Pauls companion*, *viz.* The Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians*, *Hebrewes*, *Philemon*, which Epiſtles he wrote in bonds as the contexture, which thoſe two learned profeſſors, the one at *Heydelburg*, the other at *Saulmur*, make of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles, doth declare.

*Paraeus.* *Capellus.* *Heb.* 13. 23. We finde not onely that *Timothy* was with *Paul* at *Rome*, but a priſoner with him there.

So that it appears that *Timothy* was no Biſhop, but a Miniſter, an Evangeliſt, a fellow labourer of the Apoſtles, 1 *Theſ.* 3. 1. an *Apoſtle*, a *Meſſenger* of the Church, 2 *Cor.* 8. 3. *a Miniſter of God*, 1 *Theſ.* 3. 2. theſe titles

*titles* the Holy Ghost gives him, but never the title of a *Bishop*.

The like we finde in Scripture concerning *Titus*, whom *Paul* as it is conceived by learned men, did first assume into the fellowship of his
a Anno 43 Labors in the place of *John*, and made him his companion in his jour-
b Anno 45 ny through *Antioch* a to *Hierusalem*, b so we find *Gal.* 2. 1. from thence returning to *Antioch* againe; from thence he passed through *Syria* and *Cilicia*, confirming the *Churches*; and from *Cilicia*, he passed to *Creet*, where having Preached the Gospel, and plainted Churches, he left *Ti-*
* Anno 46 *tus* * there *for a while, to set in order things that remaine*,

Yet it was *but for a while* he left him there, for in his Epistle which he wrote to him not many yeares after, he injoynes him to come to him
* Anno 51 to *Nicopolis* * where he did intend to winter, but changing that purpose sends for him to *Ephesus*, where it seemes his Hyemal station was, and from thence sends him before him to *Corinth*, to enquire the state
* Anno 51 of the *Corinthians* *. His returne from thence *Paul* expects at *Troas* *, and
* Anno 52 because comming thither he found not his *expectation* there, he was so grieved in his spirit, 2 *Cor.* 2.12. that he passed presently from thence into *Macedonia*, where *Titus* met him; and in the midst of his afflictions joyed his spirits with the glad tydings of the powerful and gracious effects, his first Epistle had among the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 7, 5,6,7. *Paul* having there collected the Liberalities of the Saints, sends *Titus* againe
* Anno 53 to the * *Corinthians*, to prepare them for the same service of Ministring to the necessities of the Saints, 2 *Cor.* 8.6. And makes him with some others the Conveyers of that second Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

All these journeyes to and fro did *Titus* make at the designment of the *Apostle*, even after he was left in *Creet*. Nor doe we finde, that after
* Anno 64 his first removal from *Creet* *, he did ever returne thither. We read indeed, 2 *Tim.* 4.10. he was with *Paul* at *Rome*, and from thence returned not to *Creet*, but into *Dalmatia*. All which doth more then probably shew, it never was the *Intendment* of the *Apostle* to fix *Titus in Creet as a Bishop*, but onely to leave him there for a *season* for the good of *that Church*, and to call him from thence, and send him abroad to other Churches for their good, as their necessities might require. Now who that will acknowledge a *Distinction* between the *Offices of Bishops and Evangelists*, and knows wherein that *Distinction lyes*, will not upon these premisses conclude that *Timothy and Titus were Evangelists and NOT Bishops*.

I but some of the *Fathers* have called *Timothy and Titus Bishops*. We grant it true; and it is as true, that *some of the Fathers* have called them *Archbishops* and *Patriarks*; yet it doth not follow, they were so. We adde, secondly, that when the Fathers did call them so, it was not in a *proper* but in an *improper* sense; which we expresse in the words of our *Raynolds contra Hart Ca.* 6: *Learned Orthodox Raynolds*;

You may learne by the Fathers themselves, saith he, that when they tearmed

termed any Apostle a Bishop of this or that City (as namely S. *Peter* of *Antioch* or *Rome*) they meant it in a general sort and signification, because they did attend that Church for a time, and supply that roome in preaching the Gospel, which Bishops did after; but as the name of Bishop is commonly taken for the *Overseer* of a particular Church, and Pastor of a several flock; so *Peter* was not Bishop of any one place; therefore not of Rome. And this is true by *Analogy* of all extraordinary Bishops, and the same may be said of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that he saith of *Peter*.

But were it true that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops: will this Remonstrant undertake, that all his party shall stand to his Conditions? *If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by Apostolick Authority delegated to, and required of* Timothy *and* Titus, *and the Angels of the seaven* Asian *Churches, let them be disclaimed as usurpers.* Will our Bishops indeed stand to this? then *actum est.* Did ever *Apostolick Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to ordain alone? to governe alone? and do not our Bishops challenge that power? Did ever *Apostolique Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* and *Titus*, to rebuke an Elder? no; *but to entreat him as a Father*: and do not our Bishops challenge themselves and permit to their *Chancellors*, *Commissaries*, and *Officials* power not only to *Rebuke an Elder*, but to *rayle upon an Elder*? to reproach him with the most opprobrious termes of *foole*, *knave*, *jack-sauce*, *&c.* which our paper blushes to present to your *Honors* view? Did ever *Apostolick Authority* delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus* power to receive an accusation against an *Elder*, but before two or three witnesses? and do not our Bishops challenge power to proceed *Ex Officio*, and make Elders their own Accusers? Did ever *Apostolick Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to reject any after twice admonition, but an *Heretick*? and do not our Bishops challenge power to reject and eject the most *sound* and *Orthodox* of our *Ministers*, for refusing the use of a *Ceremony*? as if *Non-conformity* were *Heresie*. So that either our *Bishops must disclaime this Remonstrance*, or else *themselves must be disclaimed as usurpers.*

But if *Timothy* and *Titus* were no Bishops, or had not this power, it may be the Angels of the *seven* Asian *Churches* had; and our Remonstrant is so subtile as to twist these two together, that if one faile, the other may hold.

To which we answer; first, that Angel in those Epistles is put *Collectively*, not *Individually*; as appears by the *Epistle* to *Thyatira*, *cap.* 2. *vers.* 25. where we read ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς, &c. But I say unto *you* (in the plural number, not unto *thee* in the singular) *and unto the rest in Thyatira*, *&c.* Here is a plain distinction between the members of that Church. By *you*, is signified those to whom he spake under the name of the Angel. By *the rest*, the residue of the people. The people governed, and the Governours in the plural number. What can be more evident

so prove, that by *Angel* is meant not one singular person, but the whole company of Presbyters that were in *Thyatira*.

This also further appears, because it is usual with the holy Ghost, not only in other Books of the Scripture, but also in this very Book of the *Revelation*, to express a company under one singular person. Thus the Civil State of Rome, as opposite to Christ, is called *A beast with ten horns*: and the Ecclesiastical State Antichristian is called *the whore of Babylon*, and, *the false Prophet*; and the Devil and all his family is called *An old red Dragon*. Thus also the seven Angels that blew the seven trumpets, *Revel.* 8. 2. and the seven Angels that poured out the seven Vials, are not literally to be taken, but Synecdochically, as all know. And why not then the seven Angels in those Epistles? Mr. *Mede* in his Commentaries upon the *Revelation*, pag. 265, hath these words; *Denique (ut jam semel iterumq; monuimus) quoniam Deus adhibet angelos providentiæ suæ in rerũ humanarũ motibus & conversionibus ciendis, gubernandisq; administris: idcirco, quæ multorum manibus peraguntur, Angelo tamen tanquam rei gerendæ* præsidi & Duci *pro communi loquendi modo tribuuntur.*

Adde, thirdly, that the very name *Angel* is sufficient to prove, that it is not meant of one person alone, because the word *Angel* doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction or preheminence, but is a common name to all Ministers, and is so used in Scripture. For all Ministers are Gods Messengers and Embassadours, sent for the good of the Elect. And therefore the name being common to all Ministers, why should wee think that there should be any thing spoken to one Minister, that doth not belong to all? The like argument we draw from the word *Stars* used *Revel.* 1. 20. *The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches.* Now it is evident, that all faithful Ministers are called Stars in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the Churches, in all purity of doctrine and holiness of conversation. And in this sense, the word is used, when it is said, that *the third part of the stars were darkned*, Revel. 8. 12. and that the *Dragons taile drew the third part of the stars of Heaven, and cast them to the Earth*, Revel. 12. 4. Which is meant not only of Bishops, but of other Ministers, unless the Bishops will appropriate all corruption and Apostacy unto themselves.

Adde, fourthly, out of the Text it selfe, it is very observable, that our Saviour in opening the mystery of the Vision, *Revel.* 1. 20. saith; *The seven Candlesticks which thou sawest, are the seven Churches*, but he doth not say, The seven Stars are the seven Angels of the same Churches, *But the Angels of the seven Churches*; wherein not without some mystery the number of the Angels is omitted, least we should understand by Angel, one Minister alone, and not a company. And yet the Septenary number of Churches is twice set down.

Lastly, though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident, that the Epistles themselves are dedicated to all the Angels and

and Miniſters in every Church, and to the Churches themſelves: And if to the whole Church, much more to the Presbyters of that Church. This is proved *Revel.* 1. 11. *What thou ſeeſt, write in a Book, and ſend it to the ſeven Churches which are in* Aſia. And alſo by the Epiphonema of every Epiſtle; *He that hath an eare to hear, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches.* Upon which words, *Ambroſius Ausbertus* in his ſecond book upon the *Revelation*, ſaith thus; *Unâ eademq; locutione & Angelos & Eccleſias unum eſſe deſignat. Nam cum in principio locutionum quæ ad ſeptem fiunt Angelos dicat, & Angelo illius Eccleſiæ ſcribe; in fine tamen earundem non dicit, Qui habet aurem audiat quod ſpiritus dicat Angelo, ſed quid Eccleſiæ dicat.* By one and the ſame phraſe of ſpeech he ſheweth, the Angels and the Churches to be one and the ſame. For whereas in the beginning of his ſpeech, which he makes to the ſeven Churches, he ſaith, *And write to the Angel of the Churches*; yet in the cloſe of the ſame, he doth not ſay, He that hath an Eare, let him heare what the Spirit ſaith to the Angel, but *what he ſaith to the Church.* And this is further proved by the whole argument of thoſe Epiſtles, wherein the admonitions, threatnings, commendations, and reproofes, are directed to all the Miniſters of all the Churches. *Revel.* 2. 10. *The Devil ſhall caſt ſome of you into priſon, &c.* Revel. 2. 16. *I will fight againſt them with the ſword of my mouth,* Revel. 2. 24. *I will put upon you no other burthen, &c. I ſay unto you and the reſt of* Thyatira, *as many as have not this Doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, &c.* And when it is ſaid in the ſingular Number (as it is often) *I know thy works and labour, &c.* verſ. 2. and verſ. 4. *Repent and do thy firſt works*; and verſ. 13. *Thou haſt not denyed my Faith, &c.* and *cap.* 3. 26. *Becauſe thou art neither hot nor cold, &c.* All theſe and the like places, are not to be underſtood as meant of one individual perſon, but of the whole company of Miniſters, and alſo of the whole Church, becauſe that the puniſhment threatned, is to the whole Church; *Revel.* 2. 5. *Repent and do thy firſt works, or elſe I will come unto thee quickly and remove thy Candleſtick out of his place*; Rev. 2. 16. *Repent, or elſe I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight againſt thee with the ſword of my mouth*; Revel. 2. 24. *I will not put upon you any other burthen.* Now we have no warrant in the Word to think that Chriſt would remove his Goſpel from a Church for the ſin of one Biſhop, when all the other Miniſters, and the Churches themſelves are free from thoſe ſins. And if God ſhould take this courſe, in what woeful & miſerable condition ſhould the Church of *England* be, which groaneth under ſo many corrupt Prelates? By all this it appears, that the word *Angel*, is not to be taken, ἰδιωτικῶς, but συλλητικῶς; not properly, but figuratively. And this is the judgment of Maſter *Perkins* upon the ſecond Chapter of the *Revelation*: and of Maſter *Brightman*: and of Doctor *Fulke*, who in anſwer to the Rhemiſts in *Apoc.* 1. 20. hath theſe words: S. *Iohn* by the Angels of the Churches

meaneth not all that ſhould wear on their heads Myters, and hold crofier ſtaves in their hands, like dead Idols, but them that are the faithful meſſengers of Gods word, and utter and declare the ſame. Again, they are called the Angels of the Churches, becauſe they be Gods meſſengers.

Maſter *Fox* likewiſe in his Meditation upon the *Revelation* (pag. 7. 9. 17.) is of this opinion, and hath gathered to our hands the opinions of all Interpreters he could meet, and ſaith that they all conſent in this that under the perſon of an Angel, the Paſtors & Miniſters of the Churches were underſtood. S. *Auſtin* in his 132. Epiſtle, ſaith thus, *Sic enim in Apocalypſi legitur Angelus, &c. Quod ſi de Angelo ſuperiorum cœlorum, & non de* Præpoſitis Eccleſiarum *vellet intelligi, non conſequenter diceret,* Habeo adverſum te, &c. And ſo in his ſecond Homily upon the *Revelation* (if that book be his) *Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ* Habeo adverſum te pauca, *dicit* Præpoſitis Eccleſiarum, &c. This alſo *Gregory* the Great, *lib.* 34. *Moral. in Iob. cap.* 4. *Sæpe ſacram ſcripturam prædicatores Eccleſiæ pro eo quod patris gloriam annunciant, angelorum nomine ſolere deſignare: & hinc eſſe, quod Iohannes in Apocalypſi* ſeptem Eccleſiis ſcribens, angelis Eccleſiarum loquitur, *id eſt,* Prædicatoribus populorum. Maſter *Box* citeth *Primaſius, Haymo, Beda, Richard, Thomas,* and others, to whom we refer you.

If it be here demanded (as it is much by the Hierarchical ſide) that if by Angel be meant the whole company of Presbyters, why Chriſt did not ſay, to the Angels in the plural number, but to the Angel in the ſingular?

We anſwer, that though this queſtion may ſavor of a litle too much curioſity, yet we will make bold to ſubjoyn three conjectural reaſons of this phraſe of ſpeech.

Firſt, it is ſo uſed in this place, becauſe it is the common language of other Scriptures in types and viſions to ſet down a certain number for an uncertain, & the ſingular number for the plural. Thus the Ram, *Dan.* 8. 3. is interpred verſ. 20. to be the Kings of Media, and Perſia. And the enemies of Gods Church are ſet out by four horns. And the deliverers by four Carpenters, *Zach.* 1. 18. 20. And the wiſe and fooliſh Virgins are ſaid to be five wiſe and five fooliſh. And many ſuch like. And therefore as we anſwer the Papiſts, when they demand why Chriſt if he meant figuratively when he ſaith, *this is my body*, did not ſpeak in plain language, *this is the ſign of my body*? We ſay, that this phraſe of ſpeech is proper to all Sacraments: So we alſo anſwer here, this phraſe of ſpeech, *Angel* for *Angels*, is common to all types and viſions.

Secondly Angel is put, though more be meant, that ſo it may hold proportion with the viſion which *John* ſaw, Chap. 1. 12. 20. *He ſaw ſeven golden Candleſticks, and ſeven Stars.* And therefore to hold proportion, the Epiſtles are directed to ſeven Angels, and to ſeven Churches.

And

And this is called a myſtery, Revel. 1. 20. *The Myſtery of the ſeven Stars. &c.* Now a myſtery is a ſecret which comprehends more then is expreſſed; and therefore though but one *Angel* be expreſſed, yet the myſtery implyes all the *Angels* of that Church.

Thirdly, to ſignifie their unity in the Miniſterial function, and joynt commiſſion to attend upon the feeding and governing of one Church, with one common care, as it were with one hand and heart. And this ii more fitly declared by the name of one Angel, then of many. We often finde the name of (one) Prophet or Prieſt to be put for the general body of the Miniſtery, or whole multitude of Prophets or Prieſts, in the Church of *Iſrael* or *Iudah*, when the Spirit of God intendeth to reprove, threaten, or admoniſh them. Thus it is *Iere.* 6. 13. 18. 19. *Iſa.* 3. 2. *Hoſ.* 9. 8. *Ezek.* 7. 26. *Hoſ.* 4, 6. *Mal.* 2. 7. Neither ſhould it ſeem ſtrange, that a multitude or company of Miniſters ſhould be underſtood under the name of one Angel, ſeeing a multitude of Heavenly Angels (imployed in one ſervice for the good of Gods Saints) is ſometimes in the Scripture ſhut up under one Angel in the ſingular number, as may be gathered from *Gen.* 14. 7. 2 *Kings* 19. 35. *Pſal* 34. 7. compared with *Pſal.* 91. 11. *Gen.* 32. 1. 2. *Kings* 6. 16, 17. And alſo a multitude of Devils or evil Angels, jointly labouring in any one work, is ſet forth under the name of one evil or unclean ſpirit, 1 *Kings* 22. 21, 22. *Mark* 1. 23, 24. *Mark* 5. 2. 9. *Luke* 4. 33. 34. *Luk.* 8. 27. 30. 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. *Heb.* 2. 14. *Epheſ.* 6. 11. 12.

But now let us ſuppoſe (which yet notwithſtanding we will not grant) that the word *Angel* is taken individually for one particular perſon, as Doctor *Reynolds* ſeems to interpret it, together with Maſter *Beza*, yet nevertheleſſe, there will nothing follow out of this acception, that will any ways make for the upholding of a Dioceſan Biſhop, with ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction, as a diſtinct Superior to Presbyters. And this appears,

Firſt, becauſe it never was yet proved nor ever will (as we conceive) that theſe Angels were Dioceſan Biſhops, conſidering that Pariſhes were not divided into Dioceſſes in S. *Johns* dayes. And the ſeven Stars are ſaid to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſticks or Churches, not one Star over divers Candleſticks. Neither can thoſe Churches be thought to be Dioceſan, when not onely *Tindal* and the old tranſlation, calls them ſeven Congregations, but we read alſo *Acts* 20. that at *Epheſus* which was one of thoſe Candleſticks, there was but one flock.

And ſecondly, we further finde that in *Epheſus* one of thoſe ſeven Churches, there were many Presbyters, which are all called Biſhops, *Acts* 20. 28. and we finde no colour of any ſuperintendency or ſuperiority of one Biſhop over another. To them in general the Church is committed to be fed by them without any reſpect had to *Timothy*, who ſtood at his Elbow, and had been with him in Macedonia, and was now

waiting.

waiting upon him to Jeruſalem. This is alſo confirmed by *Epiphanius* who writing of the Hereſies of the *Miletians*, ſaith, that in ancient times this was peculiar to *Alexandria*, that it had but one Biſhop, whereas other Cities had two. And he being Biſhop of *Cypres*, might well be acquainted with the condition of the Churches of *Aſia*, which were ſo nigh unto him.

Thirdly, there is nothing ſaid in the ſeven Epiſtles that implyeth any ſuperiority or majority of rule or power that theſe Angels had over the other Angels that were joyned with them in their Churches. It is written indeed, in commendation of the Angel of the Church of *Epheſus*, *that he could not beare them that were evil, and that he had tryed them which ſay they were Apoſtles and are not, and had found them lyers.* And it is ſpoken in diſpraiſe of the Angel of *Pergamus*, *that he ſuffered them which held the Doctrine of Balaam, &c.* But theſe things are common duties requirable at the hands of all Miniſters, who have the charge of ſouls.

But ſuppoſe that there were ſome ſuperiority and prehemenency inſinuated by this individual Angel, yet who knoweth not that there are diverſe kinds of ſuperiority? to wit, of Order, of Dignity, of Gifts and Parts, or in degree of Miniſtery, or in charge of power and juriſdiction. And how will it be proved that this Angel if he had a ſuperiority, had any more then a ſuperiority of Order, or of Gifts and Parts? Where it is ſaid, that this Angel was a ſuperior degree or order of Miniſtery above Presbyters? In which Epiſtle is it ſaid that this Angel had ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction? And therefore as our learned Proteſtants prove againſt the Papiſts, that where Chriſt directed his ſpeech to *Peter* in particular and ſaid, *I will give unto thee the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven; &c.* That this particularization of *Peter* did not import any ſingular preheminence or majority of power to *Peter* more then to the other Apoſtles; But that though the promiſe was made to *Peter*, yet it was made to him in the name of all the reſt, and given to all as well as one. And that therefore it was ſpoken to one perſon, and not to all; that ſo Chriſt might fore-ſignifie the unity of his Church, as * *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *Hierome*, *Optatus*, and others ſay. So when Chriſt directs an Epiſtle to one Angel, it doth not imply a ſuperior power over his fellow-Angels, but at moſt only a preſidency for order ſake. And that which is written to him, is written to the reſt as well as to him. And therefore written to one, not to exclude the reſt, but to denote the unity that ought to be between the Miniſters of the ſame Church in their common care and diligence to their flock. And this is all that Doctor *Reynolds* ſaith, as you may read in his conference with *Hart*, *cap.* 4. *diviſ.* 3. *ad finem.* For it is evident that Doctor *Reynolds* was an utter enemy to the *Ius Divinum* of the Epiſcopal preheminency over Presbyters, by his Letter to Sir *Francis Knolls*

* *Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuerat Petrus, pări conſortio prædîti & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur, ut Eccleſia una monſtretur.*

*Knolls.* And learned Maſter *Beza* alſo ſaith ſomething to the ſame purpoſe in his Annotations upon *Revel.* 2. 1. *Angelo.* 1. πρεσβύτερι *quem nimirum oporuit imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac per eum cæteros collegas totamque adeo Eccleſiam. Sed hinc ſtatui Epiſcopalis ille gradus poſtea humanitus in Eccleſiam Dei invectus certe nec poteſt nec debet, imo ne perpetuum quidem iſtud* πρεσβύτερος *munus eſſe neceſſario oportuiſſe, ſicut exorta inde Tyrannis Oligarchica (cujus apex eſt Antichriſtiana beſtia) certiſſimæ cum totius non Eccleſiæ modo, ſed etiam orbis pernicie, nunc tandem declarat.*

If therefore our *Remonſtrant* can produce no better evidence for his Hierarchy then *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the *Angels of the Aſian Churches*, Let not this Remonſtrant and his party, cry out of wrong, *if this claimed Hierarchy be for ever hooted out of the church*, ſeeing it is his owne Option. And yet we cannot conceale one refuge more out of Scripture, to which the Hierarchy betake themſelves for ſhelter. And that is the two Poſtſcripts in the end of *Pauls* ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and of that to *Titus*; where in the one, *Timothy* is ſaid to be the firſt Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and in the other, *Titus* is ſaid to be the firſt Biſhop of the Church of the *Cretians*: to both which places wee anſwer.

That theſe two Poſtſcrips (and ſo all the reſt) are no part of Canonical Scripture. And therefore our former and ancienter Engliſh tranſlations, though they have theſe Poſtſcripts, yet they are put in a ſmall character different from that of the Text. Although our Epiſcopal men of late in newer impreſſions have inlarged their Phylacteries, in putting thoſe Poſtſcripts in the ſame full character with that of the Text, that the ſimple might beleeve they are Canonical Scripture. The Papiſts themſelves (*Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and the Rhemiſts) confeſſe that there is much falſity in them. The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, is thus ſubſcribed: *the firſt to* Timothy *was written from* Laodicea, *whoch is the chiefeſt City of* Phrygia Pacatiana. Here wee demand, whether *Paul* when hee writ the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was aſſured he ſhould live to write a ſecond, which was written long after? And if not; How comes it to bee ſubſcribed, *the firſt to Timothy*, which hath relation to a ſecond? Beſides, the Epiſtle is ſaid to bee writ from *Laodicea*, whereas *Beza* in his Annotations proves apparently, that it was written from *Macedonia*; to which Opinion *Baronius* and *Serrarius* ſubſcribe. It is added, *Which is the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* But this Epithet is nowhere read in the Writers of thoſe ages, ſaith *Beza*, *Sed apud recentiores illos, qui Romani imperii jam inclinantis provincias deſcripſerunt.* So that by this place it is evident, that the ſubſcription was added a long while after the writing

writing of the Epiſtles by ſome men, for the moſt part *vel indoctis*, ſaith *Beza*, *vel certe non ſatis attentis*, Either by a Learned, or negligent man.

The ſecond Epiſtle is thus ſubſcribed; *The ſecond Epiſtle unto* Timothy, *ordained the firſt Biſhop of the Church of the* Epheſians, *was written from* Rome, *when* Paul *was brought before* Nero *the ſecond time.* Now theſe words *Ordained the firſt Biſhop*, is wanting, ſaith *Beza*, *in quibuſdam vetuſtis codicibus, in veteri vulgatâ editione, & apud Syrum interpretem.* If Saint *Paul* had written this Poſtſcript, he would not have ſaid, *To* Timothy *the firſt Biſhop, &c.* whereas it was not yet certain whether ever there ſhould bee a ſecond. Neither would it bee ſaid when *Paul was brought, &c.* But when I was the ſecond time brought before *Nero.* The Syriack Interpreter reads it, *Here ends* the *ſecond Epiſtle to* Timothy *written from* Rome.

The Epiſtle to *Titus* is thus ſubſcribed: *Written to* Titus, *Ordained firſt Biſhop of the Church of the* Cretians, *from* Nicopolis *of* Macedonia. Here it is ſaid that this Epiſtle was written from *Nicopolis*, whereas it is cleare that *Paul* was not at *Nicopolis* when he wrote it. *Tit.* 3. 12. Be *diligent to come to me at* Nicopolis, *for I have determined there to winter.* Hee doth not ſay, *Here to winter*, but *There*; Where note, for the preſent he was not there. And beſides it is ſaid, that *Titus* was *Ordained the firſt Biſhop, &c.* And who was the ſecond? or was there ever a ſecond? And alſo *He is ſaid to be Biſhop*, not onely of a Dioceſs, *but of all Creet.* Was there ever ſuch a ſecond Biſhop? Adde, laſtly, that it is ſaid, *Biſhop of the Church of the* Cretians; Whereas it would bee ſaid of the *Churches of the Cretians.* For the Chriſtian Churches of any Nation are called Churches by *Luke* and *Paul*, not Church. Therefore *Codex Claremontanus* ſubſcribes; *Here ends the Epiſtle to* Titus, and no more. So the Syriack; *Finitur Epiſtola ad* Titum *quæ ſcripta fuit è Nicopoli.* The old Vulgar Edition hath nothing of the Epiſcopacy of *Titus.* By all this it appears, that if the Biſhops had no more authority to urge us to ſubſcribe to their Ceremonies, then they have authority for their Epiſcopal Dignity by theſe Subſcriptions, there would be no more ſubſcription to Ceremonies in the Churches of England.

But ſome will ſay, that there is one objection out of Scripture yet unanſwered, and that is from the inequality that was betweene the twelve Apoſtles, and the ſeventy Diſciples.

To which we anſwer;

Firſt, that it cannot be proved that the twelve Apoſtles had any ſuperiority over the ſeventy, either of Ordination, or Juriſdiction, or that there was any ſubordination of the ſeventy unto the twelve: but ſuppoſe it was, yet we anſwer

Secondly

Secondly, that a superiority and inferiority betweene Officers of different kindes, will not prove that there should be a superiority and inferiority between Officers of the same kinde. No man will deny but that in Christs time, there were Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers, and that the Apostles were superior to Evangelists and Pastors But it cannot be proved, that one Apostle had any superiority over another Apostle, or one Evangelist over an other. And why then should one Presbyter be over another? Hence it followeth, that though we should grant a superiority between the twelve and the seventy, yet this will not prove the question in hand. Because the question is concerning Officers of the same kind, and the instance is of Officers of different kinds, amongst whom no man will deny but there may be a superiority and inferiority, as there is amongst us between Presbyters and Deacons.

And now let your *Honours* judge (considering the premisses) how far this Episcopal government is from any *Divine right*, or *Apostolical Institution:* And how true that speech of *Hierome* is, that a Bishop as it is a superiour Order to a Presbyter, is *an Humane presumption*, not a *Divine Ordinance.*

But though Scripture fails them, yet the indulgence and Munificence of *Religious Princes* may support them, and to this the *Remonstrant* makes his next recourse, yet so as he acknowledgeth here, *Ingagements to Princes onely for their accessory dignities, titles, and Maintenance; not at all for their stations and functions,* (wherein yet the author plainly acknowledgeth a difference between our *Bishops* and the *Bishops of old* by such accessions.)

For our parts, we are so farre from envying the *gracious Munificence of pious Princes, in collating honourable maintenance upon the Ministers of Christ*, that we beleeve, that *even by Gods own Ordinance, double Honour* is due unto them.

And that by how much the *Ministery of the Gospell* is more *honourable* then that of *the Law*, by so much the more ought all that embrace the *Gospell*, to be carefull to provide, that the *Ministers of the Gospell* might not onely live, but maintain Hospitalitie, according to the Rule of the *Gospell.* And that *worthy Gentleman* spake as an Oracle, that said, *That scandalous Maintenance is a great cause of a scandelous Ministery.*

Yet we are not ignorant, that when the Ministery came to have *Agros, domos, locationes, vehicula, equos, latifundia,* as they

*foſt. Hom. 86 in Matth.* That then *Religio peperit divitias, & filia devoravit Matrem*, Religion brought forth riches, and the Daughter devoured the Mother; and then there was a voice of Angels heard from Heaven; *Hodie venenum in Eccleſiam Chriſti cecidit.* This day is poiſon ſhed into the Church of Chriſt.

And then it was that *Ierom* complained, *Chriſti Eccleſia poſtquam ad Chriſtianos principes venit, potentiâ quidem & divitiis major, ſed virtutibus minor facta eſt.* Then alſo was that Conjunction found true; That when they *had wooden Chalices*, they had *golden Prieſts*; but when their *Chalices were golden, their Prieſts were wooden.*

And though we do not think, there is any ſuch *incompoſſibility*, but that *large Revenues may be happily managed with an humble ſociablneſſe*, yet is very rare to finde Hiſtory tells us, that the ſuperfluous revenues of the *Biſhops* not onely made them neglect their *Miniſtery*, but further uſhered in their ſtately and pompous attendance; which did ſo elevate their ſpirits, that they inſulted over their brethren, both *Clergy* and *People*, and gave occaſion to others to hate and abhorre the Chriſtian Faith, Which *Euſebius* ſets forth fully in the pride of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, vvho notwithſtanding the meanneſſe and obſcurity of his birth, afterwards grew to that *height of inſolency and pride* in all his carriage, eſpecially in that numerous traine that attended him in the ſtreets, and in his ſtately throne raiſed after the manner of Kings and Princes, that *Fides noſtra invidiæ, & odio, propter faſtum & ſuperbiam cordis illius, facta fuerit obnoxia*; The Chriſtian Faith vvas expoſed to envy and hatred through his pride.

*Euſeb. lib. 7. cap. 29.*

And as their ambition (fed vvith the largeneſſe of their revenues) diſcovered it ſelf in great attendance, ſtately dvvellings, and all Lordly pomp, ſo *Hierom* complaines of their pride in their ſtately ſeates, *qui velut in aliqua ſublimi ſpecula conſtituti, vix dignantur videre mortales & alloqui conſervos ſuos*: who ſitting aloft as it were in a vvatch-tovver, vvill ſcarce deigne to looke upon poore mortalls, or ſpeake to their fellovv-ſervants.

Here vve might be large in multipying ſeveral teſtimonies againſt the pride of Eccleſiaſticall perſons, that the largeneſſe of their revenues rayſed them to: but we will conclude with that grave complaint of *Sulpitius Severus.*

*Ille qui antè pedibus aut aſello ire conſueverat, ſpumante equo ſuperbus invehitur; parvâ priùs ac vili cellula contentus habitare, erigit celſa Laquearia, conſtruit multa conclavia, ſculpit poſtes, pingit armaria, veſtem-*

*veſtem reſpuit groſſiorem, indumentum molle deſiderat, &c.* Which becauſe the practice of our times hath already turned into Engliſh, we ſpare the labour to tranſlate.

Onely ſuffer us (being now to give a *Vale* to our Remonſtrants arguments) to recollect ſome few things.

Firſt, whereas this Remonſtrant ſaith; *If we do not ſhew out of the true & genuine writings of thoſe holy men, that lived in the Apoſtles dayes a clear & received diſtinction of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as three diſtinct ſubordinate callings, with an evident ſpecification of the duty belonging to each of them: Let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever rooted out of the Church:* We beſeech you, let it be remembred how we have proved out of the *genuine* and *undeniable writings of the Apoſtles themſelues*, that theſe are not three diſtinct callings: *Biſhops* are Presbyters, *being with them all one, Name and Office*, and that the diſtinction of Biſhops and Presbyters was not of *Divine* Inſtitution, but Humane: and that theſe Biſhops, in their firſt Inſtitution did not differ ſo much from Presbyters, as our preſent Biſhops differ from them. *Pag.* 22.

*Secondly*, Whereas this Remonſtant ſaith, *If our Biſhops challenge any other power then was by Apoſtolike authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the Aſian Churches:* Let them be diſclaimed as uſurpers. Wee deſire it may be remembred, how we have proved firſt; that *Timothy* and *Titus* and the Angels who are Dioceſan Biſhops; and ſecondly, that our Biſhops challenge (if not in their Polemickes, yet in their Practicks) a power that *Timothy* and *Titus*, and thoſe Angels never did. *Pag.* 23.

Thirdly, Whereas this Remonſtrant ſaith, *If there can be better evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact, let Epiſcopacy be for ever abandoned out of Gods Church:* We beſeech you remember how weake we have diſcovered his Evidence to be; and then the *Inference* upon all theſe *we humbly* leave to your *Honours Wiſdom and Juſtice.* *Pag.* 24.

## SECT. XIV.

HAving thus conſidered the validity of thoſe arguments, whereby this *Remonſtrant* would ſuffult *Epiſcopacy*, we deſcend now to inquire, what ſatisfaction he gives to thoſe objections, which himſelf frames as the main, if not the ſole arguments, that *Epiſcopacy* is aſſaultable by, and they are two.

First, *that pleading the Divine right of Episcopacy is to the prejudice of Sovereignty.* Secondly, *that it casts a dangerous imputation upon all those Reformed Churches that want this Government.*

To the first, the *prejudice of Sovereignty*; he answers there is a compatibleness in this case of *Gods Act*, and the Kings: it is God that makes the Bishop, the King that gives the Bishoprick.

But we have proved already, that God never made a Bishop, as he stands in his *Superiority* over al other *Presbyters*, he never had Gods *Fiat*: and if they disclaim the influence of sovereignty unto their *creation* to a Priority, and assert that the King doth not make them *Bishops*, they must have no being at all. Sure we are, the Laws of the Land proclaim, that not only *Bishopricks, but Bishops and all the Jurisdiction* they have, is from the King: whereas the *Remonstrant* acknowledgeth no more, but the bare * place and exercise to be from *Regall donation*, which cannot be affirmed without appareut prejudice of that Sovereigntie which the Lawes of the Land have invested our Princes with.

37. *Hen.* 8. *cap.* 17.

*The Remonstrant here acknowledges the same of the King, that Frier *Simon* a *Florentine* did of the Pope, who affirmed the degree of a Bishop was *de jure divino*, but every particular Bishop *de jure Pontificio*. *Hist. con. Trid.*

And for his unworthy comparison of *Kings* in order to *Bishops*, and *Patrons* in order to their *Clerkes*, when he shall prove that the *Patron* gives *ministerial power* to his *Clerke*, as the *King* according to our Laws gives *Episcopall power* to the *Bishop*, it may be of some conducement to his cause; but till then, we leave the unfitnesse of this comparison, and the unthankfulnesse of those men to the indulgence of their Sovereigne, to their deserved recompence.

*Pag.* 28, 29.

His learned answer to such men as borrowing Saint *Ieroms* phrase, speake Saint *Pauls truth*, is in summe this:

*That he knowes not how to prescribe to mens thoughts, but for all his Rhetoricke, they will think what they list; but if they will grant him the question, they shall soon be at an end of the quarrell:* which one answer if *satisfactory*, would silence all controversies to as good purpose as he did *Bellarmine*, who said, *Bellarmine* saith it is thus, and I say it is not, and where is *Bellarmine* now?

*Pag.* 29.

To the second objection, that *Episcopacie thus asserted casts an imputation upon all the reformed Churches, that want that Government*, he saith, *that the objection is intended to raise envie against them*; who (if they may be beleeved) *love and honour those sister-Churches, and blesse God for them.*

But do they out pluck all this envie upon themselves, who in their *Conferences, Writings Pulpits, Universities, Disputes, High Commission, Declamations, have disclaimed them as no Churches, that have dis-*

*disclaimed the Prelates* and have honoured the most *glorious Lights* of *those Reformed Churches, Calvin, Beza*, and others with no better titles then of *Rascals, Blasphemers? &c.*

But the pith of his answer after a few good words is this, that no such consequent can be drawn from their opinion; for their *Ius divinum* pleads only for a *Iustifiablenesse of this holy calling*: not for an absolute necessity of it, *warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had; but not fixing upon the Church that wants it, the defect of any thing of the Essence of a Church, but only of the glory and perfection of it*; neither is it their sin, but their misery.

And is it so, doth not this *Ius divinum* argue a *Necessitie*, but only a *Iustifiablenesse* of this calling? nor is the want of it a want of any thing of Essence, but onely of perfection? we had thought, that page the 20th, where this *Remonstrant* strives to fetch the *pedegree of Episcopacie* from no lesse than *Apostolicall*, and in that right *Divine institution* he had reckoned it among those things, which the Apostles ordained for the succeeding administration of the Church *in essentiall matters*: but here it seemes he is willing to retract what there fell from him: there it was to his advantage to say, this Government was a thing essentiall to the Church, and here it is no lesse advantage to say, it is not essentiall.

But if it be not Essentiall, then what is the reason that when a *Priest* who hath received Orders at *Rome*, turnes to us, they urge not him to receive ordination among us again: but when some of our brethren, who flying in Queene *Maries* dayes, had received *Imposition of hands* in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, returned again in the dayes of Queene *Elizabeth*, they were urged to receive Imposition of hands againe from our Bishops, and some did receive it. If those Churches that want Bishops, want nothing essentiall to a Church; then what *Essentiall* want was there in the Ordination of those *Ministers* that received Imposition of hands in those Churches, that might deserve a *Re-ordination*, more than if they had first received their Ordination at *Rome*?

And what is the reason that Bishop *Mountague* so confidently affirmes, that Ordination by Episcopall hands is so necessary, as that the Church is no true Church without it, and the Ministery no true Ministery, and ordinarily no salvation to be obtained without it? And if this *Remonstrant* should leave Bishop *Mountague* to answer for himself, yet notwithstanding he stands bound to give us satisfaction to these two questions, which arise from his own Book. First,

*Originum Ecclesiasticarum tomi primi pars posterior*, 463, 464.

Firſt, whether *that Office*, which by *divine right* hath the *ſole power of Ordaining*, and *Ruling* all other *Officers* in the Church, (as he ſaith Epiſcopacie hath) belong not to the being, but onely to the glory and perfection of a Church? Secondly, there being (in this mans thoughts) the ſame *Ius divinum* for Biſhops, that there is for *Paſtors* and *Elders*, whether if thoſe *Reformed Churches* wanted *Paſtors* and *Elders* too, they ſhould want nothing of the *Eſſence* of a Church, but of the *perfection and glory of it?*

But this *Remonſtrant* ſeemes to know ſo much of the minde of thoſe Churches, *that if they might have their option, they would moſt gladly embrace Epiſcopall Government, as little differing from their own Moderatorſhip, ſave onely in the perpetuitie of it, and the new Invention* (as he odiouſly calls it) *of lay-Elders.* But no queſtion thoſe learned Worthies that were intruſted *by the Churches to compile their Confeſſions, did compriſe their Iudgements better* than the *Compoſer of this Remonſtrance.* And to his preſumtion, we oppoſe their Confeſſion. We will begin with the French Church, who in their Confeſſion ſpeake thus:

*Credimus veram Eccleſiam gubernari debere eâ politiâ, quam Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus ſancivit, ità videlicet, ut ſint in ea Paſtores, Preſbyteri, ſive Seniores, & Diaconi, ut doctrinæ puritas retineatur, &c.* Art. 29. *Credimus omnes Paſtores ubicunque collocati ſunt, eâdem & æquali poteſtate inter ſe eſſe præditos ſub uno illo capite ſummóque & ſolo univerſali Epiſcopo Jeſu Chriſto.* Art. 30. *Gallicæ Confeſſionis. Credimus veram hanc Eccleſiam debere regi, ac gubernari, ſpirituali illâ politiâ, quàm nos Deus ipſe in*

We believe that the true Church ought to be governed by that policy which Chriſt Jeſus our Lord eſtabliſhed, *viz.* that there be Paſtors, Presbyters, or Elders, and Deacons. And again, We believe that all true Paſtors whereever they be, are endued with equal and the ſame power, under one chief Head and Biſhop Chriſt Jeſus. Conſonant to this the *Dutch* Churches: We believe (ſay they) the true Church ought to be ruled with that ſpiritual policy which God hath taught us in

*verbo suo edocuit; ità ut sint in ea Pastores ac Ministri, qui purè & concionentur, & Sacramenta administrent; sint quoque Seniores & Diaconi, qui Ecclesiæ Senatum constituant, ut his veluti mediis vera Religio conservari, Hominésque vitiis dediti spiritualiter corripi & emendari possint. Tunc enim ritè & ordinatè omnia fiunt in Ecclesiâ, cùm viri fideles, & pii ad ejus gubernationem deliguntur juxta Divi* Pauli *præscriptum*, 1 Tim. 3. *Confes. Belgic.* Art. 30. *Cæterùm ubicunque locorum sunt verbi Dei Ministri, eandem atque æqualem* Omnes *habent tum* Potestatem *tum* Authoritatem, *ut qui sunt æquè Omnes Christi unici illius universalis Episcopi & capitis Ecclesiæ Ministri.*

in his Word, to wit, that there be in it Pastors to preach the Word purely, Elders and Deacons to constitute the Ecclesiastical Senate, that by these means Religion may be preserved, and manners corrected. And so again, We believe wherever the Ministers of God are placed, they *All* have the same *equal Power* and *Authority*, as being *All* equally the Ministers of Christ.

In which Harmony of these Confessions, see how both Churches agree in these five points:

First, That there is in the Word of God, an exact form of Government set down; *Deus in verbo suo edocuit.* 1.

Secondly, That this form of Government Christ established in his Church; *Jesus Christus in Ecclesiâ sancivit.* 2.

Thirdly, That this form of Government is by Pastors, Elders, and Deacons. 3.

Fourthly, That the true Church of Christ ought to be thus governed; *Veram Ecclesiam debere regi.* 4.

Fifthly, That all true Ministers of the Gospel are of equal power and authority. 5.

For the reason he assigns, why those Churches should make this Option, we cannot enough admire that such a passage should fall from his pen, as to say, There is *little difference between their* πρεσβεία, *and our Episcopacy, save onely in perpetuity and lay-Elders*; for who knows not that between these two there is a vast difference

as

as between the *Duke of Venice* and an *absolute Monarch*. For, 1, the Moderator in *Geneva* is not of a superiour order to his Brethren; nor 2, hath an Ordination differing from them; nor 3, assumes power of sole Ordination or Jurisdiction; nor hath he 4, maintenance for that Office above his Brethren; nor 5, a Negative voice in what is agreed by the rest; nor 6, any further power then any of his Brethren. So that the difference between our Bishops and their Moderators is more then *Little*: But if it be so little as this *Remonstrant* here pretends; then the *Alteration* and *Abrogation* of *Episcopacy* will be with the lesse *difficulty*, and *occasion the less disturbance*.

## SECT. XV.

But there is another thing, wherein our *Episcopacy differs* from the *Geneva Moderatorship*, besides the perpetuity; and that is the *exclusion of the Lay-Presbytery*, which (if we may believe this *Remonstrant*) *never till this age had footing in the Christian Church*.

In which assertion, this *Remonstrant* concludes *so fully*, with Bishop *Halls Irrefragable Propositions*, and his other Book of *Episcopacie by Divine right*, as if he had conspired to swear to what the Bishop had said.

Now, though we will not enter the Lists with a man of that *learning* and *fame*, that Bishop *Hall* is, yet we dare tell this *Remonstrant*, that this his assertion hath no more truth in it, *then the rest that we have already noted*. We will (to avoid prolixity) not urge those * three known Texts of Scripture, produced by some for the establishing of Governing Elders in the Church, *not yet vindicated by the Adversaries*,

Nor will we urge that famous Text of * *Ambrose* in 1 *Tim.* 5.

But if there were no *Lay-Elders* in the Church till this present age, we would be glad to learn, who they were of whom *Origen* speaks, when he tells us, it was the Custome of Christian Teachers, first to examine such as desired to heare them, of whom there were *two orders*; the first were *Catechumeni*, or beginners; the other was of such as were more perfect: among whom εἰσί τινες τεταγμένοι πρὸς τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν τὰς βίους καὶ τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῶν προσόντων, &c. *Nonnulli præpositi sunt qui in vitam & mores eorum qui admittuntur inquirant, ut qui turpia committant eos communi Cœtu interdicant qui verò ab istis abhorrent, ex animo complexi, meliores quotidie reddant*:

There

* 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Rom. 12. 8.

* *Unde & Synagoga, & posteà Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesiâ. Quodquâ negligentiâ obsolverit nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidiâ, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri.* *Origen. Lib. 3. contra Celsum.*

There are some ordained to inquire into the life and manners of such as are admitted into the Church, that they may banish such from the publique Assembly, that perpetrate scandalous Acts; which place tells us plainly:

First, that there were some in the higher forme of hearers (not Teachers) who were *Censores morum* over the rest. Secondly, that they were designed or constituted to this work, τεταγμένοι. Thirdly, that they had such Authority intrusted into their hands, as that they might interdict such as were scandalous from the publique Assemblies. We would gladly know, whether these were not, as it were, *Lay-Eelders?*

That there were such in the Church (distinguished from others that were called to teach) appeares. *Augustine* writing to his Charge, directs his Epistle, *Dilectissimis fratribus, Clero, Senioribus, & universæ Plebi Ecclesiæ Hipponensis:* where first there is the generall compellation, *Fratribus, Brethren*; Then there is a distribution of these Brethren into the *Clergie*, the *Elders*, and the *whole People*; so that there were in that Church Elders distinguished both from the Clergie, and the rest of the People. *Epist.* 137.

So again, *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum: Omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, and Seniores scitis*; *All you Bishops*, Elders, Deacons, and Elders do know. What were those two sorts of Elders there mentioned in one *comma*, *and ibidem cap.* 56. *Peregrinus Presbyter & Seniores Ecclesiæ Musticanæ Regionis tale desiderium prosequuntur*; where again we read of *Elder and Elders*, *Presbyter*, *and Seniors* in one Church. *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 1.

Both those passages are upon record in the publick acts, which are more fully set down by *Baronius*, *Anno* 303. *Num.* 15, 16, 17. As also by *Albaspineus*, in his Edition of *Optatus*: in which Acts the *Seniors* are often mentioned. In that famous relation of the purging of *Cæcilianus* and *Felix*, there is a copie of a Letter; *Fratribus & filiis: Clero & Senioribus*, *Fratribus in Domino æternam salutem:* Another Letter is mentioned a little before, *Clericis & Senioribus Carthensium in Domino æternam Salutem.* These Seniors were interessed in affaires concerning the Church as being the men, by whose advice they were managed.

The Letter of *Purpurius* to *Silvanus* saith, *Adhibete conclericos, & seniores plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, & inquirant quæ sint iste Dissensiones: ut ea quæ sunt secundum fidei Præcepta fiant*, Where we see the joynt power of these Seniors, with the Clergie in ordering Ecclesiasticall

siastical affairs; that by their wisdom and care peace might be setled in the Church; for which cause, these *Seniors* are called *Ecclesiastical men*; and yet they are distinguished from *Clergie men*.

They are mentioned again afterwards by *Maximus*, saying, *Loquor nomine SENIORUM Populi Christiani*. *Greg. Mag.* distinguisheth them also from the Clergie: *Tabellarium cum consensu SENIORUM & Cleri memineris Ordinandum.*

*Aug. Serm. 19. de Verb. Dom.* These Seniors had power to reprove offenders, otherwise why should *Augustine* say, *Cùm ob errorem aliquem à Senioribus arguuntur, & imputatur alicui cur ebrius fuerit, cur res alienas pervaserit, &c.* when they were by the Elders reproved for their errours, and drunkenness is laid to a mans charge, &c. So that it was proper to the Seniors to have the cognizance of Delinqents, and to reprove them.

*August. in Psal. 38. Conc. 2.* The same *Augustine* in *Psal. 36. Necesse nos fuerat Primiani causam, quem, &c. Seniorum literis ejusdem Ecclesiæ post plantibus audire.* Being requested by Letters from the *Seniors* of that *Church*, it was needful for me to hear the cause of *Primian*, *&c.*

So again, *Optatus*, who mentioning a persecution that did for a while scatter the Church, saith, *Erant Ecclesiæ ex auro & argento quàm plurima Ornamenta, quæ nec defodere terræ, nec secum portare poterat, quare fidelibus Senioribus commendavit Albaspineus*, that learned Antiquary, on that place acknowledges, that *Besides the Clergie there were certain of the Elders of the people, men of approved life, that did tend the affairs of the Church, of whom this place is to be understood.*

By all these testimonies it is apparent; first, that in the ancient Church there were some called *Seniors*. Secondly, that these *Seniors* were not Clergie men. Thirdly, that they had a stroke in governing the Church, and managing the affairs thereof. Fourthly, that *Seniors* were distinguished from the rest of the people.

*Pag. 32.* Neither *would we desire to chuse any other Judges in this whole controversie*, then whom himself constituted; Forreign Divines, taking the general Suffrage and practice of the Churches, and not of particular men.

As for the learned *Spanhemius* whom he produceth, though we give him the deserved honour of a worthy man: yet we think it too much to speak of him, as if the judgment of the *whole Church of Geneva* were incorporated into him, as this Remonstrant doth. And for *Spanhemius* himselfe, we may truly say, in the place cited,

he

he dilivered *a complement*, rather then his *judgement*, which in Dedicatorie Epistles is not unusuall. We know that reverend *Calvins* and learned *Beza* have said as much upon occasion in their Epistles, and yet the Christian world knowes their Judgement was to the contrary

Little reason therefore hath this Remonstrant, to declaime against all such as speake against this Government as unlawfull, with the *termes of Ignorance and spitefull Sectaries*, because they call the Government unlawfull: had they proceeded further to call it Antichristian, (which he charges upon them) they had said no more, then what our eares have heard some of their *principall* Agents, their *Legati à Latere* speake publikely in their *visitations*: *That however the Church of England be as sound, and Orthodox in her Doctrine as any Church in the World, yet in our Discipline and Government we are the same with the Church of Rome*, which amounts to as much as to say the *Government is Antichristian*, unless they will say, the Government of *Rome* is not so, nor the Pope Antichrist. Pag. 33 Pag. 33 Doct. Ducks.

## SECT. XVI.

NOw our *Remonstrant* begins to leave his dispute for the *Office*, and flowes into the large praises of the *Persons*, and what is wanting in his *Arguments* for the *Place*, thinks to make up in his *Encomiasticks* of the *Persons*, that have possest that place in the *Church of God*: and tells us, that *the Religious Bishops of all times are and have been they that have strongly upheld the truth of God against Satan and his Antichrist*. It is well he sets this crown only upon the heads of *Religious Bishops*, as knowing that there are and have been some *Irreligious ones*, that have *as strongly upheld Satan and his Antichrist against the truth of God*. But *the Religious Bishops are they that have all times upheld the truth*. What? *they? and onely they?* did never any uphold the truth, but a *Religious Bishop?* did never any Religious *Minister* or *Professour preach*, or *write*, or *die*, to uphold the truth, but a *Religious Bishop?* if so, then there is some perswasive strength in that he saith; and a credulous man might be induced to think, *If Bishops go down, truth will go down too*: But if we can produce for *one Bishop many others* that have been valiant for the truth, this Rhethoricall insinuation will contribute no great help to their establishment. Nor indeed any at Pag. 34

 all; unlesse

Pag. 33. * We may rather think that they would have done more. Remembring what *Martinus* was wont to say to his friend *Sulpitius*, *Nequaquam sibi in Episcopatu eam virtutum Gratiam suppetisse, quam prius se habuisse meminisset. Sulpitius Severus Dial. 2.*

unlesse he were able to make this good *of our times*, as well as of all others, which he assaies; for saith he, *Even amongst our own how many of the reverend & learned Fathers of the Church now living, have spent their spirits, & worne out their lives in the powerfull opposition of that man of sin?* how many? I Sir, we would fain know how many: that there are *some* that have stood up to beare witnesse against that *Man of sin*, we acknowledge with all due respect, to the Learning and worth of their Persons. But that their Episcopall dignity hath added either any *flame to their zeal, or any Nerves to their ability*, we cannot believe, nor can we think they would have done lesse in that cause, though they had beene no Bishops.

But what if this be true of some Bishops in the Kingdome, is it true of all? are there not some that have spent their spirits in the *opposition of Christ*, as others have in the opposition of Antichrist? and are there none bu *Zealous, Religious Prelates* in the Kingdom? *are there none upon whom the guilt of that may meritoriously be charged, which others have convincingly and meritoriously opposed?* And are there not some Bishops in the Kingdome, that are so far from opposing the *Man of sin*, that even this *Remonstrant* is in danger of suffering under the name of *Puritan* for daring to call him by that name? we doubt not but this *Remonstrant* knowes there are.

Pag. 35. *But if he will against the light of his own Conscience, beare up a known errour out of private respects, (we will not say these papers) but his own Conscience, shall one day be an evidence against him before the dreadfull Tribunall of the Almighty.*

Pag. 35. But there is yet a second thing that should endeare *Episcopacie, and that is the careful, peaceable, painfull, conscionable mannaging of their Charges; to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithfull people.* Which (in not seeming to urge) he urgeth to the full and beyond. This care, conscience, paines of our Bishops, is exercised and evidenced, either in their Preaching, or in their Ruling; for their Preaching, it is true, some few there are that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*; whose *persons* in that respect we *Honour*: but the most are so far from Preaching, that they rather discountenance, discourage, oppose, blaspheme Preaching.

It was a *Non-preaching Bishop*, that said of a *Preaching Bishop*, *He was a Preaching Coxcomb*. As for the discharge of their office of ruling, their entrusting their *Chancellors*, and other Officers with their visitations, and Courts (as ordinarily they do, whiles themselves attend the Court) doth abundantly witnesse their *care in it*.

The

The many and loud cries of the intolerable *oppreſſions* and *tyrannies* of their Court-proceedings; witneſſe *their peaceableneſſe*, their unjuſt fees, exactions, commutations; witneſſe *their conſcionableneſſe in managing their Charges, to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithfull people.*

And hence it is that ſo many at this day hear ill; (how deſervedly, ſaith this Remonſtrant, God knows;) and do not your Honours know, and doth not this *Remonſtrant* know? and doth not all the Nation (that will know any thing) know how deſervedly *Some*, nay, *Moſt*, nay, *All the Biſhops of this Nation* hear ill, were it but onely for the late Canons and Oath? *But why ſhould the faults of ſome, diffuſe the blame to all?* Why? by your owne argument, that would *extend the deſerts of ſome*, to the *patronage of All*; and if it be a *fault in the impetuous and undiſtinguiſhing Vulgar, ſo to involve all, as to make Innocency it ſelf a ſin*; what is it in a Man *able to diſtinguiſh*, by the *ſame implication*, to ſhrowd *ſinne* under *Innocencie*, the ſin of many under the *Innocency* of a *few?* *Pag.* 36. *Pag.* 36.

But have our Biſhops *indeed* beene ſo *carefull, painfull, conſcionable*, in managing their Charges? how is it then that there are ſuch *manifold ſcandalls of the inferiour Clergy* preſented to your *Honours view*, which he cannot *mention without a bleeding heart*; and yet could finde in his *heart* (if he knew how) to excuſe them? and though he confeſſe them to be the *ſhame and miſery of our Church*, yet is he not aſhamed to plead their cauſe at your Honours BARRE, *Onuphrius*-like, that was the *Advocate of every bad cauſe*; and to excite you by *Conſtantines* example (in a different Cauſe alleadged) if not to ſuffer thoſe Crimes, which himſelfe calls hatefull, to paſſe unpuniſhed, yet not to bring them to that *open and publique puniſhment* they have deſerved. *Pag.* 37.

But what, if pious *Conſtantine* (in his tender care to prevent the Diviſions that the emulation of the Biſhops of that age, enraged with a ſpirit of envie and faction, were kindling in the Church, leſt by that meanes the Chriſtian Faith ſhould be derided among the Heathens) did ſuppreſſe their mutuall accuſations, many of which might be but upon ſurmiſes; and that not *in a Court of Juſtice*, but in an *Eccleſiaſticall Synode*; ſhall this be urged before the higheſt *Court of Juſtice upon earth*, to the patronizing of *Notorious ſcandalls, and hateſull enormities*, that are already proved by evidence of cleare witneſſe?

*But oh forbid it to tell it in Gath, &c.* What, the ſin? alas, that is done *Pag.* 37.

done already; Do we not know, the drukenneſſe, profaneneſſe ſuperſtition, Popiſhneſſe of the Engliſh Clergie rings at *Rome* already? yes undoubtedly; and there is no way to vindicate the Honour of our *Nation*, *Miniſtery*, *Parliaments*, *Sovereigne*, *Religion*, *God*; but by cauſing the puniſhment to ring as farre as the ſin hath done; that our adverſaries that have triumphed in their ſin, may be confounded at their puniſhments. Do not your *Honours* know, that the plaiſtring or palliating of theſe rotten members, will be a greater diſhonour to the Nation and Church, then their cutting off; and that the perſonall acts of theſe *ſonnes of Belial*, being connived at, become Nationall ſins?

But for this one fact of *Conſtantine*, we humbly crave your *Honours* leave to preſent to your wiſdome three Texts of Scripture, *Ezek.* 44.12.13. *Becauſe they miniſtred unto them before their Idols, and cauſed the houſe of Iſrael to fall into iniquity, therefore have I lift up my hand unto them, ſaith the Lord, and they ſhall beare their iniquity. And they ſhall not come neere unto me, to do the Office of a Prieſt unto me, nor to come neere unto any of mine holy things in the moſt holy place, &c.*

The ſecond is *Jerem.* 48.10. *Curſed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently*: and the third is, *Judges* 6.31. *He that will plead for Baal, let him be put to death while it is yet morning.* We have no more to ſay in this; whether it be beſt to walk after the *Preſident of Man*, or the *Preſcript of God*, your *Honours* can eaſily judge.

## SECT. XVII.

*Pag.* 39. But *ſtay*, ſaith this *Remonſtrant*; and indeed he might well have ſtayed and ſpared the labour of his enſuing diſcourſe, about the Church of *England*, the *Prelaticall* and the *Antiprelaticall* Church: but theſe Epiſcopall Men deale as the *Papiſts* that dazle the eyes, and aſtoniſh the ſenſes of poor people, with the glorious name of the *Church*, the *Church*; *The holy Mother the Church*. This is the *Gorgons head*, as Doctor* *White* ſaith, that hath inchanted them, & held them in bondage to thetr Errors: All their ſpeech is of the *Church*, *the Church*; no mention of the *Scriptures*, *of God the Father*; but all of the *Mother the Church*. Much like as they write of certain *Æthiopians*, that by reaſon they uſe no marriage, but promiſcuouſly company together, the children only follow the *Mother*; the *Father* and his name is in no requeſt, but the mother hath all the reputation

* In his Preface to his Book called, *The way to the True Church. Solinus.*

putation. So is it with the Author of this *Remonſtrance*, he ſtiles himſelf, *a Dutifull ſon of the Church*. And it hath beene a Cuſtome of late times to cry up the holy *Mother the Church of England*, to call for abſolute obedience to *holy Church*; full conformity to the orders of *holy Church*; Neglecting in the meane time *God the Father, and the holy Scripture*.

But if we ſhould now demand of them, what they meane by the *Church of England*? this *Author* ſeemes to be thunder-ſtricken at this Queſtion; and calls the very *Queſtion*, *a new Divinity*; where he deales like ſuch as holding great revenues by unjuſt Titles, will not ſuffer their Titles to be called in Queſtion. *Pag.* 39.

For it is apparent, *Ac ſi ſolaribus radiis deſcriptum eſſet* (to uſe *Tertullians* phraſe) that the word *Church* is an *Equivocall word*, and hath as many ſeverall acceptions as letters; and that *Dolus latet in univerſalibus*. And that by the Church of *England*; firſt by ſome of theſe men is meant onely the *Biſhops*; or rather the two *Archbiſhops*; or more properly the *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*: Juſt as the *Jeſuited Papiſts* reſolve the Church and all the glorious Titles of it into *the Pope*; ſo do theſe into the *Archbiſhop*, or at fulleſt, they underſtand it of *the Biſhops and their party met in Convocation*; as the more ingenuous of the Papiſts make the *Pope and his Cardinals* to be *their Church*: thus excluding all the *Chriſtian people and Presbyters of the Kingdome*; as not worthy to be reckoned in the number of the *Church*.

And which is more ſtrange, this Author in his *Simplicity* (as he truly ſaith) *never heard, nor thought of any more Churches of England then one*; and what then ſhall become of his *Dioceſan Churches*, and *Dioceſan Biſhops*? And what ſhall we think of *England*, when it was an *Heptarchy*? had it not then ſeven Churches, when ſeven Kings? Or if the *Bounds of a Kingdome* muſt conſtitute the *Limits and Bounds of a Church*, why are not *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, all *one Church*? when they are happily united under one *gracious Monarch*, into one Kingdom? We read in Scripture, of the Churches of *Judea*, and the Churches of *Galatia*: and why not the Churches of *England*? not that we denie the *Conſociation* or *Combination* of Churches into a Provinciall or Nationall Synod for the right ordering of them. But that there ſhould be no *Church in England*, but a *Nationall Church*: this is that *which this Author* in his *ſimplicity* affirmes, of which the very rehearſall is a refutation.

Sect.

## SECT. XVIII.

THere are yet two things with which this *Remonſtrance* ſhuts up it ſelf, which muſt not be paſt without our Obelisks.

Firſt, he ſcoffs at the *Antiprelatical Church*, and the *Antiprelatical Diviſions*; for our parts, we acknowledge no *Antiprelatical Church*. But there are a company of men in *the Kingdom*, *of no mean rank or quality*, for *Piety*, *Nobility*, *Learning*, that ſtand up to bear witneſs againſt the *Hierarchie* (as it now ſtands:) their uſurpations over Gods Church and Miniſters, their cruel uſing of Gods people by their tyrannical government: this we acknowledge; and if he call theſe the *Antiprelatical Church*, we doubt not but your Honours will conſider, that there are many thouſands in this Kingdom, and thoſe pious and worthy perſons, that thus do, and upon moſt juſt cauſe.

It was a ſpeech of *Eraſmus* of *Luther*, *Ut quiſque vir eſt optimus, ità illius Scriptis minimè offendi*; The better any man was, the leſs offence he took at *Luthers* Writings: but we may ſay the contrary of the Prelates, *Ut quiſque vir eſt optimus, ità illorum factis magis offendi*; The better any man is, the more he is offended at their dealings. And all that can be objected againſt this party, will be like that in *Tertullian*. *Benus vir Cajus Sejus, ſed malus tantùm, quia Antiprelaticus*. But he upbraids us with our *Diviſions* & *Subdiviſions*, ſo do the Papiſts upbraid the Proteſtants with their *Lutheraniſme*, *Calviniſme*, and *Zuinglianiſme*. And this is that the Heathens objected to the Chriſtians, their Fractures were ſo many, they knew not which Religion to chuſe if they ſhould turn Chriſtians: And can it be expected that the Church in any age ſhould be free from Diviſions, when the times of the Apoſtles were not free? and the Apoſtle tells us, *It muſt needs be that there be diviſions*: in *Greg. Naz.* dayes there were 600 Errours in the Church; do theſe any wayes derogate from the truth and worth of Chriſtian Religion?

*Tertull. adverſ. Gent.*

But as for the Diviſions of the Antiprelatical party, ſo odiouſly exaggerated by this Remonſtrant: Let us aſſure your Honours, they have been much fomented by the *Prelates*, whoſe practice hath been according to that rule of *Machiavil*: *Divide & Impera*, and they have made theſe diviſions, & afterwards complain'd of that which their Tyranny and Policy hath made. It is no wonder, conſidering the paths our Prelates have trod, that there are Diviſions in the Nation. The wonder is our diviſions are no more,

no greater; and we doubt not but if they were of that gracious spirit, and so intirely affected to the peace of the Church as *Greg. Naz.* was, they would say as he did in the tumults of the people, *Mitte nos in mare, & non erit tempestas*; rather then they would hinder that sweet *Concordance*, and conspiration of minde unto a Government that shall be every way agreeable to the rule of Gods Word, and profitable for the edification and flourishing of the Church.

A second thing we cannot but take notice of, is the pains this *Author* takes to advance his *Prelaticall Church*: and forgetting what he had said in the beginning: *that this party was so numerous*, it could not be summed; tells us now, *these severall thousands are punctually calculated*. But we doubt not but your Honours will consider that there may be *multi homines, & pauci viri*; and that there are more against them then for them. *Pag.* 2. *Pag.* 41.

And whereas they pretend, that they differ from us onely in a Ceremony or an Organ-pipe, (which however is no contemptible difference) yet it will appeare that our differences are in point of a superiour Alloy. Though this Remonstrant braves it in his multiplied Queries. *What are the bounds of this Church? what the distinction of the professours and Religion?* what grounds of faith? what new Creed do they hold different from their Neighbours? what Scriptures? what Baptisme? what meanes of Salvation other then the rest? yet if he pleased he might have silenced his owne Queries: but if he will needs put us to the answer, we will resolve them one by one. *Pag.* 41.

First, if he ask what are the bounds of this Church? we answer him out of the sixt of their late founded Canons: where we finde the limits of this Prelatical Church extend as farre as from the high & lofty Promontory of Archbishops, to the *Terra incognita* of an, *&c.*

If what *Distinction of professors and Religion*; we answer, their worshipping towards the East, and bowing towards the Altar prostrating themselves in their approches into Churches, placing all Religion in outward formalities, are visible differences of these professours and their Religion

*If what new Creed* they have, or what grounds of Faith differing from their Neighbours? we answer, Episcopacy by divine right is the first Article of their Creed, Absolute and blinde obedience to all the Commandements of the Church (that is, the Bishop and his Emissaries) election upon faith foreseen, the influence of works into *Justification*, falling from grace, &c.

*If what Scripture?* we answer, the Apocrypha and unwritten Traditions.

 *If*

*If what Baptiſm?* a Baptiſm of abſolute Neceſſity unto ſalvation; and yet unſufficient unto ſalvation: as not ſealing grace to the taking away of ſinne after Baptiſme.

*If what Euchariſt?* an Euchariſt that muſt be adminiſtred upon an Altar or a Table ſet Altar-wiſe, railed in an Euchariſt, in which there is ſuch a preſence of Chriſt, (though *Modum nesciunt*) as makes the place of its Adminiſtration the *throne of God*, the place of the *Reſidence of the Almighty*; and impreſſeth ſuch a holineſſe upon it as makes it not only capable, but worthy of Adoration.

*If what Chriſt?* a Chriſt who hath given the ſame power of abſolution to a Prieſt that himſelfe hath.

*If what Heaven?* a Heaven that hath a broad way leading thither, and is receptive of Drunkards, Swearers, Adulterers, &c. ſuch a heaven as we may ſay of it, as the Indians ſaid of the heaven of the Spaniards: Unto that heaven which *ſome of the Prelaticall Church* living and dying in their *ſcandalous* ſinnes, and hatefull enormities go to, let our ſoules never enter.

*If what meanes of Salvation?* we anſwer, confeſſion of ſinnes to a Prieſt, as the moſt abſolute, undoubted, neceſſary, infallible meanes of Salvation.

Pag. 41. Farre be it from us to ſay with this *Remonſtrant*, We do fully agree in all theſe and all other Doctrinall, and practicall points of Religion, and preach one and the ſame ſaving truths. Nay, we muſt rather ſay as that holy Martyr did, *We thank God we are* none of you.

Pag. 42. Nor do we becauſe of this diſſenſion feare the cenſure of uncharitableneſs from any but uncharitable men. But it is no unuſuall thing with the Prelates and their party, to charge ſuch as proteſt againſt their corrupt opinions and wayes, with uncharitableneſſe and Schiſme, as the Papiſts do the Proteſtants: and as the proteſtants do juſtly recriminate, and charge that Schiſme upon the Papiſts, which they object to us; So may we upon the Prelates: And if *Auſtin* may be judge, the Prelates are more Schiſmaticks then we. *Quicunque* (ſaith he) *invident bonis, ut quarant occaſiones excludendi eos, aut degradandi, vel crimina ſua ſic defendere parati ſunt (ſi objecta vel prodita fuerint) ut etiam conventiculorum congregationes vel Eccleſiæ perturbationes cogitent excitare, jam ſchiſmatici ſunt.* Whoſoever envie thoſe that are good, and ſeeke occaſions to exclude and degrade them, and are ſo ready to defend their faults, that rather then they will leave them, they will deviſe how to raiſe up troubles in the Church, and drive men into conventicles and corners, they are the Schiſmaticks.

And that all the world may take notice what juſt cauſe we have

to

to complain of Episcopacie, as it now stands, we humbly crave leave to propound these *Queries*.

*Queries about Episcopacie,*

1 WHether it be tolerable in a Christian Church, that Lord Bishops should be held to be *Jure Divino*; And yet the Lords day by the some men to be but *Jure Humano*? And that the same persons should cry up *Altars* in stead of *Communion-Tables*, and *Priests* in stead of *Ministers*, and yet not *Judaize*, when they will not suffer the Lords Day to be called the Sabbath-day, for feare of *Judaizing*? Whereas the word *Sabbath* is a generall word, signifying a day of rest, which is common as well to the Christian Sabbath, as to the Jewish Sabbath, and was also used by the Ancients, *Ruffinus in Psal.* 47. *Origen. Hom.* 23. *in Num. Gregory Nazian.*

2 Whether that assertion, No Bishop, No King; and no Ceremonie, no Bishop; be not very prejudiciall to Kingly Authority? For it seemes to imply, that the Civill power depends upon the Spiritual, and is supported by Ceremonies and Bishops.

3 Whether seeing it hath been proved, that Bishops (as they are novv asserted) are a meere humane Ordinance, it may not by the same Authority be abrogated, by vvhich it vvas first establisshed; especially, considering the long experience of the hurt they have done to Church and State?

4 Whether the advancing of Episcopacie into *Jus Divinum*, doth not make it a thing simply unlavvfull to submit to that Government? Because that many conscientious men that have hitherto conformed to Ceremonies and Episcopacy, have done it upon this ground, as supposing that Authority did not make them matters of vvorship, but of Order and Decencie, &c. And thus they satisfied their consciences in answvering those Texts, *Colos.* 2. 20, 21, 22. *Matth.* 15. 9. But novv since Episcopacy comes to be challenged as a Divine Ordinance, hovv shall vve be responsible to those Texts? And is it not, as it is novv asserted, become an Idoll, and like the Brazen Serpent to be ground to povvder?

5 Whether there be any difference in the point of Episcopacy betweene *Jus Divinum* and *Jus Apostolicum*? Because we finde some claiming their standing by *Jus Divinum*; others by *Jus Apostolicum*. But we conceive that *Jus Apostolicum* properly taken, is all one with *Jus Divinum*. For *Jus Apostolicum* is such a *Jus*, which is founded upon the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, written by them so as to be a perpetuall Rule for the succeeding Administration of the Church, as this Author saith, *Pag.* 20. And this *Jus* is *Jus Divinum*, as well as *Apostolicum*. But if by *Jus Apostolicum* they mean impro-

perly (as some do) such things which are not recorded in the Writings of the Apostles, but introduced, the Apostles being living, they cannot be rightly said to be *Jure Apostolico*, nor such things which the Apostles did intend the Churches should be bound unto. Neither is Episcopacie as it imports a superioritie of power over a Presbyter, no not in this sense *Jure Apostolico*, as hath beene already proved, and might further be manifested by divers Testimonies, if need did require. We will only instance in *Cassander* a man famous for his immoderate moderation in controverted Points of Religion, who in his *Consultat. Articul.* 14. hath this saying, *An Episcopatus inter ordines Ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit? Convenit autem inter omnes, Apostolorum etate inter Presbyterum & Episcopum nullum discrimen fuisse, &c.*

6. Wether the distinction of *Beza*, between *Episcopus Divinus, Humanus*, & *Diabolicus*, be not worthy your Honours consideration? By the Divine Bishop, he meanes the Bishop as he is taken in Scripture, which is one and the same with a Presbyter. By the humane Bishop he meanes the Bishop chosen by the Presbyters to be President over them, and to rule with them by fixed Lawes and Canons. By the Diabolical Bishop, he means a Bishop with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, Lording it over Gods heritage, and governing by his owne will and authority. Which puts us in minde of the Painter that Limned two pictures to the same proportion and figure; The one he reserved in secret, the other he exposed to common view. And as the phansie of beholders led them to censure any line or proportion, as not done to the life, he mends it after direction: If any fault be found with the eye, hand, foot, &c. He corrects it, till at last the addition of every mans fancy had defaced the first figure, and made that which was the Picture of a man, swell into a monster: Then bringing forth this and his other Picture which hee had reserved, he presented both to the people. And they abhorring the former, and applauding the latter, he cried, *Hunc populus fecit*: This deformed one the People made: This lovely one I made. As the Painter of his Painting, so (in *Beza*'s sense) it may be said of Bishops, God at first instituted Bishops, such as are all one with Presbyters; and such are amiable, honourable in all the Churches of God. But when men would be adding to Gods institution, what power, preheminence, Jurisdiction, Lordlines their phansie suggested unto them, this divine Bishop lost his Original beauty, and became to be *Humanus*. And in conclusion (by these and other aditions swelling into a Pope) *Diabolicus*.

*Hunc populus fecit.*

7. Whether the Ancient Fathers, when they call *Peter Marke, James,*

*Iames*, *Timothy*, and *Titus* Biſhops, did not ſpeak according to the Language of the times wherein they lived, rather then according to the true acception of the word Biſhop? and whether it be not true which is here ſaid in this Book, that they are called Biſhops of *Alexandria*, *Epheſus*, *Hieruſalem*, &c. in a very improper ſenſe, becauſe they abode at thoſe places a longer time then at other places? For ſure it is, if Chriſt made *Peter* and *James* Apoſtles (which are Biſhops over the whole world) and the Apoſtles made *Marke*, *Timothy* and *Titus* Evangeliſts, &c. it ſeemes to us that it would have been a great ſin in them to limit themſelves to one particular Dioceſſe, and to leave that calling in which Chriſt had placed them.

Whether Presbyters in Scripture are called προηγούμενοι & πρωτάμενοι, and that it is an office, required at their hands, to rule and to govern, as hath bin proved in this Book; The Biſhops can withont ſin arrogate the exerciſe of this power to themſelves alone, and why they may not with the ſame lawfulneſs, impropriate to themſelves alone the Key of Doctrine (which yet notwithſtanding al would condemn) as well as the Key of Diſcipline, ſeeing that the whole power of the Keys is given to Presbyters in Scripture as well as to Biſhops; as appears, *Mat.* 16. 19. where the power of the Keys is promiſed to *Peter*, in the name of the reſt of the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors; & given to all the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors, *Mat.* 18. 19. *John.* 20. 23. And that Presbyters ſucceed the Apoſtles, appears not onely, *Mat.* 28. 20. but alſo, *Acts.* 20. 28. where the Apoſtle ready to leave the Church of *Epheſus* commends the care of ruling and feeding it to the Elders of that Church. To this *Irenaus* witneſſeth, *lib* 4 *cap.* 43. 44. This Biſhop *Jewell* againſt *Harding*, *Artic.* 4. *Sect.* 5, 6. ſaith, that all Paſtors have equall power of binding and looſing with *Peter*.

Whether ſince that Biſhops aſſume to themſelves power temporall (to be Barons, and to ſit in Perliament, as Judges, and in Court of Star-Chamber, High Commiſſion, and other Courts of Juſtice) and alſo power ſpirituall over Miniſters and People, to ordain, ſilence, ſuſpend, deprive, excommunicate, &c. their ſpiritual power be not as dangerous (though both be dangerous) and as much to be oppoſed as their temporal? 1 Becauſe the ſpiritual is over our conſciences, the temporal, but over our purſes. 2 Becauſe the ſpiritual have more influence into Gods Ordinances to defile them, then the temporal. 3 Becauſe ſpiritual judgements and evils are greater then other. 4 Becauſe the Pope was Antichriſt, before he did aſſume any temporal power. 5 Becauſe the Spiritual is more inward and leſſe diſcerned: and therefore it concerns all thoſe that have Spiritual eyes, and deſire to worſhiy God in ſpirit and truth, to conſider, and

endeavour

endeavour to abrogate their Spiritual usurpations as well as their Temporal.

10 Whether *Aerius* be justly branded by *Epiphanius* and *Austin* for a Hereticke (as some report) for affirming Bishops, and Presbyters to be of an equal power?

*Epiphanius* saith he did, *Arrium ipsum dogmatum novitate superare. Austin* saith in *Arrianorum hæresin lapsum. Epiphan.* accused him, because he said that *superstitum preces* did not *opitulari eis qui ex hac vita discesserint.* And *Austin* accused *Aerius*, because he said, *Non licet orare, vel offerre pro mortuis oblationem.*

Wee say, as some report, for the truth is, he is charged with heresie meerly and onely because he was an *Arrian.* As for his opinian of the parity of a Presbyter with a Bishop; this indeed is called by *Austin, proprium dogma Aerii*, the proper opinion of *Aerius.* And by *Epiphanius* it is called *Dogma furiosum & stolidum*, a mad and foolish opinion, but not an heresie neither by the one nor the other. But let us suppose (as is commonly thought) that he was accounted an Heretick for this opinion: yet notwithstanding, that this was but the private opinion of *Epiphanius*, and borrowed out of him by *Austin*, and an opinion not to be allowed, appeares:

First, because the same Authors condemne *Aerius*, as much for reprehending and censuring the mentioning of the dead in the publique prayers, and the performing of good works for the benefit of the dead. And also for the reprehending *stata jejunia*, and the keeping of the week before Easter as a solemne Fast; which if worthy of condemnation, would bring in most of the reformed Churches into the censure of Heresie.

Secondly, because not onely Saint *Hierome*, but *Austin* himself, *Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophilact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* (as *Michael Medina* observes in the Council of *Trent*, and hath writen, *Lib.* 1. *de sacr. hom. origine.*) and yet none of these deserving the name of Fools, much lesse to be branded for Hereticks.

Thirdly, because no Councell did ever condemne this for Heresie; but on the contrary, *Concilium Aquisgranens. sub Ludovico Pio Imp.* 1. *anno* 816. hath approved it for true Divinity out of the Scriture, That Bishops and Presbyters are equal, bringing the same texts that *Aerius* doth, and which *Epiphanius* indeed undertakes to answer; but how slightly let any indifferent Reader judge.

Whitaker. *Respons. ad* Campian. *rat.* 10. hath these words: 11

Whether the great Apostasie of the Church of *Rome* hath not been, in swerving from the Discipline of Christ, as well as from the doctrine? For so it seems by that text, 2. *Thess.* 2. 4. And also, *Revel.* 18. 7 and divers others. And if so, then it much concernes all those that desire the purity of the Church, to consider, how neere the Discipline of the Church of England borders upon Antichrist;

*Aerium Epiphanius & Augustinus in hæreticis numerant, & præter eos antiquipauci. Et si Presbyterum Episcopo æquare sit hæreticum, nihil Catholicum esse potest. Cum Aerio Hieronymus de Presbyteris sensit. Illos enim jure divino Episcopis æquales esse statuit.*

leſt, while they endeavour to keep out Antichriſt from entring by the door of doctrine, they ſhould ſuffer him ſecretly to creep in by the door of Diſcipline, eſpecially conſidering, what is here ſaid in this Booke, That by their own confeſſion *the Diſcipline of the Church of England is the ſame with the Church of Rome.*

12 Whether Epiſcopacie be not made a place of Dignity, rather then Duty, and deſired onely for the great revenues of the place? And whether, if the largeneſſe of their revenues were taken away, Biſhops would not decline the great burthen and charge of ſoules neceſſarily annexed to their places, as much as the ancient Biſhops did, who hid themſelves, that they might not be made Biſhops and cut off their eares, rather then they would be made Biſhops: whereas now Biſhops cut off the eares of thoſe that ſpeak againſt their Biſhopricks? *Sozomen. hiſt. lib. 6. cap. 10.*

13 How it comes to paſs, that in *England* there is ſuch increaſe of Popery, Superſtition, Arminianiſm, and prophaneneſs, more then in other Reformed Churches? Doth not the root of theſe Diſorders proceed from the Biſhops and their adherents, being forced to hold correſpondencie with *Rome*, to uphold their greatneſs, and their Courts and Canons, wherein they ſymbolize with *Rome?* And whether it be not to be feared, that they will rather conſent to the bringing in of Popery, for the upholding of their dignities, then part with their dignities for the upholding of Religion?

14 Why ſhould *England* that is one of the chiefeſt Kingdomes in *Europe*, that ſeparates from Antichriſt, maintain and defend a Diſcipline different from all other Reformed Churches, which ſtand in the like Separation? And whether the continuance in this Diſcipline will not at laſt bring us to communion with *Rome*, from which we are ſeparated, and to ſeparation from the other Reformed Churches, unto which we are united?

15 Whether it be fit that the name Biſhop, which in Scripture is common to the Presbyters with the Biſhops (and not only in Scripture, but alſo in Antiquity for ſome hundreds of yeers) ſhould ſtill be appropriated to Biſhops, and ingroſſed by them, and not rather to be made common to all Presbyters; and the rather becauſe?

Firſt, we finde by woful experience, that the great Equivocation that lieth in the name Biſhop, hath been, and is at this day a great prop and pillar to uphold Lordly Prelacy; for this is the great *Goliah*, the maſter-piece, and indeed the onely argument with which they think to ſilence all oppoſers; to wit, the Antiquity of Epiſcopacie, that it hath continued in the Church of Chriſt for 1500 yeers, &c. which argument is cited by this Remonſtrant *ad naſeam*

*uſque*

*usque & usque*. Now it is evident that this argument is a *Paralogism*, depending upon the Equivocation of the name Bishop. For Bishops in the Apostles time were the same with Presbyters in name and office, and so for a good while after. And when afterwards they came to be distinguished, the Bishops of the Primitive times differed as much from ours now, as *Rome* ancient from *Rome* at this day, as hath been sufficiently declared in this Book. And the best way to confute this argument is by bringing in a Community of the name Bishop to a Presbyter as well as to a Bishop.

Secondly, because we finde that the late Innovators which have so much disturbed the peace and purity of our Church, did first begin with the alteration of words; and by changing the word *Table* into the word *Altar*, and the word *Minister* into the word *Priest*, and the word *Sacrament* into the word *Sacrifice*, have endeavoured to bring in the *Popish Mass*. And the Apostle exhorts us, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. *To hold fast the form of sound words*: and 1 *Tim* 6. 20. *To avoid the prophane novelties of words*. Upon which text we will only mention what the Rhemists have commented, which we conceive to be worthy consideration. (*Nam instruunt nos non solùm docentes, sed etiam errantes.*) The Church of God hath always been as diligent to resist novelties of words, as her adversaries are busie to invent them, for which cause she will not have us communicate with them, nor follow their fashions and phrase newly invented, though in the nature of the words sometimes there be no harm. Let us keep our forefathers words, and we shall easily keep our old and true faith, that we had of the first Christians; let them say, *Amendment, Abstinence*, the *Lords Supper*, the *Communion-Table*, *Elders*, *Ministers*, *Super-intendent*, *Congregation*, *So be it*, *Praise ye the Lord*, *Morning Prayer*, *Evening Prayer*, and the rest as they will; Let us avoid those novelties of words, according to the *Apostles* prescript, and keep the old terms, *Penance*, *Fast*, *Priests*, *Church*, *Bishop*, *Mass*, *Mattin*, *Even-Song*, the *B. Sacrament*, *Altar*, *Oblation*, *Host*, *Sacifice*, *Hallelujah*, *Amen*; *Lent*, *Palm-Sunday*, *Christmass*, and the words will bring us to the faith of our first *Apostles*, and condemn these new *Apostates*, new faith and phrase.

*Quest.* 16. Whether having proved that God never set such a Government in his Church as our Episcopal Government is, we may lawfully any longer be subject unto it, be present at their *Courts*, obey their *Injunctions*, and especially be instruments in publishing, and executing their *Excommunications* and *Absolutions*?

And thus we have given (as we hope) a sufficient answer, and as brief as the matter would permit, to the *Remonstrant*. With whom, though

though we agree not in opinion touching *Episcopacie* and *Liturgie*; yet we fully consent with him, to pray unto Almighty God, *Who is great in power, and infinite in wisdom, to poure down upon the whole Honourable Assembly, the spirit of wisdom, and understanding, the spirit of Counsel & might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord: That you may be able to discern betwixt things that differ, seperate between the precious and the vile, purely purge away our dross, and take away all our tin, root out every plant that is not of our heavenly Fathers planting: That so you may raise up the foundations of many generations, and be called the Repairers of breaches, and Restorers of paths to dwell in.* Even so, *Amen.*

## *APOSCRIPT.*

THough we might have added much light and beauty to our Discourse, by inserting variety of Histories upon several occasions given us in the *Remonstrance*, the answer whereof we have undertaken; especially where it speaks of the *bounty* and *gracious Munificence* of *Religious Princes* toward the *Bishops*, yet unwilling to break the threed of our discourse, and its connexion with the *Remonstrance* by so large a digression, as the whole *series* of Historie producible to our purpose, would extend unto: We have chosen rather to subjoyn by way of *Appendix*, an historical Narration of those bitter fruits, *Pride, Rebellion, Treason, Unthankfulness, &c.* which have issued from *Episcopacy*, while it hath stood under the continued influences of Sovereigne goodness. Which Narration would fill a Volume, but we will bound our selves unto the Stories of this Kingdom, and that revolution of time which hath passed over us since the erection of the *See of Canterbury*. And because in most things the beginning is observed to be a presage of that which follows, let their Founder *Austin* the Monk come first to be considered. Whom we may justly account to have been such to the English, as the Arrian Bishops were of old to the Goths, and the Jesuits now among the Indians, who of Pagans have made but Arrians and Papists. His ignorance in the Gospel which he preached is seen in his idle & Judaical consultations with the Pope, about things clean and unclean; his proud demeanour toward the British Clergy, appears in his Council called about no solid point of faith, but celebration of Easter, where having troubled and threatened the Churches of Wales, and afterwards of Scotland, about Romish Ceremonies, he is said in fine to have been the stirrer up of *Ethelbert*, by means of the Northumbrian King, to the slaughter of twelve

*Beda. Holinsh. Speed.*

hundred of those poor laborious Monks of *Bangor*. His Successors busied in nothing but urging and instituting Ceremonies, and maintaining Precedency we pass over.

*Holinsh.* out of *Capgrave. Osborn, Higden.* Till *Dunstan*, the Sainted Prelate, who of a frantick Necromancer, and suspected fornicatour, was shorn a Monk, and afterwards made a Bishop. His worthy deeds are noted by *Speed*, to have been the cheating King *Eldred* of the treasure committed to his keeping; the prohibiting of marriage, to the increasing of all filthiness in the Clergy of those times; as the long Oration of King *Edgar* in *Stow* well testifies.

*Edw Conf.* In *Edward* the Confessors dayes, *Robert* the *Norman* no sooner Archbishop of *Canterbury*, but setting the King and Earl *Godwine* at variance for private revenge, broach't a Civil War, till the Archbishop was banisht.

*Holsh.* 191.

*Will. Conq.* Now *William* the Conquerour had set up *Lankefrank* Bishop of *Canterbury*, who to requite him, spent his faithful service to the Pope *Gregory*, in perswading the King to subject himself and his State to the Papacy, as himself writes to the Pope, *Snasi, sed non persuasi.*

*Speed p.* 442.

*Will. Ruf.* The treason of *Anselm* to *Rufus* was notorious, who not content to withstand the King, obstinately in money-matters, made suit to fetch his Pall or Investiture of Archiepiscopacy from *Rome*, which the King denying as flat against his Regal Sovereignty, he went without his leave, and for his Romish good service received great honour from the Pope, by being seated at his right foot in a Synod, with these words, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostro tanquam alterius orbis Papam.* Whence perhaps it is that the See of *Canterbury* hath affected a Patriarchy in our dayes. This *Anselm* also condemned the married Clergy.

*Hen.* 1. *Henry* the First reigning, the same *Anselm* deprived those Prelates that had been Invested by the King, and all the Kingdom is vext with one Prelate, who the second time betakes himself to his old fortress at *Rome*, till the King was fain to yield. Which done, and the Archbishop returned, spends the rest of his dayes in a long

*Holshin.* 37. contention and unchristian jangling with *York* about Primacie. Which ended not so, but grew hot between *York* and *London*, as Dean to *Canterbury*, striving for the upper seat at Dinner, till the King seeing their odious pride, put them both out of doors.

*Holinsh.* 38. To speak of *Ralph* and *Thurstan*, the next Archbishops, pursuing the same quarrel, were tedious, as it was no small molestation to the King and Kingdom, *Thurstan* refusing to stand to the Kings doom, and wins the day, or else the King must be accurs'd by the Pope;

Pope; which further animates him to try the mastery with *William* next Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and no man can end it but their Father the Pope, for which they travel to *Rome*. In the mean while, marriage is sharply decreed against, *Speed* 448. and the Legate *Cremonensis*, the Declamour against Matrimony taken with a Strumpet the same night. *Holinsh.* 42, 43.

In King *Stephens* Reign, the haughty Bishops of *Canterbury* and *Winchester* bandy about Precedency; and to *Rome* to end the Duel. *Theobald* goes to *Rome* against the Kings will; interdicts the Realm, and the King forc't to suffer it; till refusing to Crown *Eustace*, the Kings Son, because the Pope had so commanded, he flies again. *K. Stephen.* *Holinsh.* 57, 58, 59.

*Becket's* pride and out-ragious treasons are too manifest; resigning the Kings gift of his Archbishoprick to receive it of the Pope; requiring the Custody of *Rochester*-castle, and the Tower of *London*, as belonging to his *Seignorie*. Protects murthering Priests from Temporal Sword; standing stifly for the Liberties and Dignities of Clerks, but little to chastise their vices, which besides other crying sins, were above a hundred murthers since *Henry* the Seconds crowning, till that time: to maintain which, most of the Bishops conspire, till the terrour of the King made them shrink; but *Becket* obdures, denies that the King of *Englands* Courts have authority to judge him. And thus was this noble King disquieted by an insolent Traitour, in habit of a Bishop, a great part of his Reigne; the Land in uproar; many Excommunicate, and accursed; *France* and *England* set to War, and the King himself curbed, and controlled; and lastly, disciplin'd by the Bishops and Monks: first, with a bare-foot penance, that drew blood from his feet, and lastly, with fourscore lashes on his anointed body with Rods. *Henry* 2. *Speed* 462. out of *Nubrigens.* Yet this mans life is lately Printed in English, as a thing to be imitated. *Holinsh* 70. *Speed* 469.

In the same Kings time it was that the Archbishop of *York* striving to sit above *Canterbury*, squats him down on his lap, whence with many a cuff he was thrown down. *Holinsh* 93.

Next the pride of *W. Longchamp*, Bishop of *Elie*, was notorious, who would ride with a thousand horse; and of a Governour in the Kings absence, became a Tyrant; for which flying in Womans apparel he was taken. *Richard* 1. *Page* 129, 130, 132.

To this succeeds contention between *Canterbury* and *York*, about carriage of their Crosses, and *Rome* appeal'd to: the Bishop of *Durham* buyes an Earldom. 144.

No sooner another King, but *Hubert* another Archbishop to vex *King John.*

vex him, and leſt that were not enough, made Chancellour of *England*. And beſides him, *Jeffery* of *York*, who refuſing to pay a Subſidy within his Precincts, and therefore all his temporalities ſeaz'd; excommunicates the Sheriff, beats the Kings Officers, and
*Speed* 503. interdicts his whole Province. *Hubert* outbraves the King in Chriſtmaſs houſ-keeping: hinders King *John* by his Legantine power from recovering *Normandy*. After him *Stephen Langton*, ſet up by the Pope in ſpite of the King, who oppoſing ſuch an affront, falls under an
*Speed* 509. interdict, with his whole Land; and at the ſuit of his Archbiſhop to the Pope, is depos'd by Papal Sentence; his Kingdom given to *Philip* the French King, *Langtons* friend; and laſtly, reſignes and enfeuds his Crown to the Pope.

*Hen* 3. After this tragical *Stephen*, the fray which *Boniface* the next Archbiſhop but one had with the Canons of Saint *Bartholmews*, is as
*Stow* 188. pleaſant; the tearing of Hoods and Cowles, the miring of Copes, the flying about of Wax Candles, and Cenſors in the ſcuffle, cannot be imagined without mirth; as his oathswere loud in this bickering, ſo his curſes were as vehement in the contention with the Bi-
*Hol.* 247. ſhop of *Wincheſter* for a ſlight occaſion. But now the Biſhops had turned their conteſting into baſe and ſervile flatteries, to advance themſelves on the ruine of the ſubjects. For *Peter de Rupibus* Biſhop of *Wincheſter* perſvvading the King to diſplace Engliſh Officers, and ſubſtitute Poictivines, and telling the Lords to their faces, that there
*Speed* 529. 530. vvere no Peeres in *England*, as in *France*, but that the King might do what he would, and by whom he would, became a firebrand to the civill wars that followed.

*Edward* 1. In this time *Peckam* Archbiſhop of *Can.* in a Synod was tamper-
*Holſh* 280. ing vvith the Kings liberties, but being threatened deſiſted. But his
*Holſh.* 301, ſucceſſor *Winchelſey* on occaſion of Subſidies demanded of the
*Holſh.* 315, Clergie, made anſvver, That having tvvo Lords, one Spirituall, the other Temporall, he ought rather to obey the Spirituall governour the Pope, but that he vvould ſend to the Pope to knovv his pleaſure, and ſo perſiſted even to beggerie. The Biſhop of *Durham* alſo cited by the King flies to *Rome*.

*Edward* 2. In the depoſing of this King vvho more forvvard, then the Bi-
*Speed* 574. ſhop of *Hereford*? vvitneſſe his Sermon at *Oxford*, My head, my head aketh, concluding that an aking and ſick head of a King vvas to be taken off vvithout further Phyſick.

*Edward* 3. *John* the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, ſuſpected to hinder the Kings
*Speed* 586. glorious victories in *Flanders*, and *France*, by ſtopping the conveyance of monies committed to his charge, conſpiring therein vvith vvish rhe Pope. But not long after vvas conſtituted that fatall

*præmunire*,

*præmunire*, vvhich vvas the first nipping of their courage, to seek aide at *Rome*. And next to that, the wide wounds that *Wickleffe* made in their sides. From which time they have been falling, and thenceforth all the smoak that they could vomit, was turned against the rising light of pure doctrine. *Holsh.* 469

Yet could not their Pride misse occasion to set other mischief on foot. For the Citizens of *London* rising to apprehend a riotous servant of the Bishop of *Salisbury* then Lord Treasurer, who with his fellowes stood on his guard in the Bishops house, were by the Bishop who maintained the riot of his servant, so complained of, that the King therewith seized on their liberties, and set a Governour over the Citie. And who knowes not, that *Thomas Arundell* Archbishop of *Canterbury* was a chief instrument and agent in deposing King *Richard*, as his actions and Sermon well declares. *Richard* 12. *Holsh.* 478. *Page* 506.

The like intended the Abbot of *Westminster* to *Henry* the fourth, who for no other reason, but because he suspected that the King did not favour the wealth of the Church, drew into a most horrible conspiracie the Earles of *Kent*, *Rutland*, and *Salisbury*, to kill the King in a turnament at *Oxford*, who yet notwithstanding was a man that professed to leave the Church in better state then he found it. For all this, soone after is *Richard Scroop* Archbishop of *York* in the field against him, the chiefe attractor of the rebellious party. *Henry* 4. *Page* 514. *Speed* 631. *Holsh.* 529.

In these times *Thomas Arundell* a great persecutor of the Gospel preached, by *Wikclefs* followers, dies a fearfull death, his tongue so swelling vvithin his mouth, that he must of necessity starve. His successor *Chickeley* nothing milder diverts the King, that vvas looking too neerly into the superfluous revenues of the Church, to a bloody warre. *Henry* 5. *Speed* 638.

All the famous conquests vvhich *Henry* the fifth had made in *France*, vvere lost by a civil dissension in *England*, vvhich sprung first from the haughty pride of *Beaufort* Bishop and Cardinall of *Winchester*, and the Archbishop of *York* against the Protector, *Speed* 674. In the civill warres the Archbishop sides with the Earle of *Warwick*, and *March* in *Kent*, *Speed* 682. *Henry* 6. *Holsh.* 596. *Page* 620.

*Edward* the Fourth, *Mountacute* Archbishop of *York*, one of the chiefe conspirators with *Warwick* against *Edward* the fourth, and afterwards his Jaylor, being by *Warwicks* treason committed to this Bishop. *Edward* 4. *Speed* 699.

In *Edward* the Fifths time, the Archbishop of *York* was, though perhaps unwittingly (yet by a certain fate of Prelacie) the unhappy instrument of pulling the young Duke of *York* out of Sanctuary, into his cruel Uncles hands. *Edward* 5.

Things

*Richard* 3. Things being ſetled in ſuch a peace, as after the bloody brawls was to the afflicted Realm howſoever acceptable, though not ſuch as might be wiſhed: *Morton* Biſhop of *Elie*, enticing the Duke of *Buckingham* to take the Crown, which ruin'd him, opened the veins of the poor ſubjects to bleed afreſh.

*Henry* 8. *Hol.* 845. 462. The intolerable pride, extortion, bribery, luxury of *Wolſey* Archbiſhop of *York*, who can be ignorant of? ſelling Diſpenſations by his power Legantine for all offences, inſulking over the Dukes and Peers, of whom ſome he brought to deſtruction by bloody policie, playing with State-affairs according to his humour, or benefit: cauſing *Tournay*, got with the blood of many a good Souldier, to be rendred at the French Kings ſecret reqneſt to him, not without bribes; with whom one while ſiding, another while with the Emperour, he ſold the honour and peace of *England*, at what rates he pleaſed; and other crimes to be ſeen in the Articles againſt him, *Holinſhed.* 912. and againſt all the Biſhops in general, 911, which when the Parliament ſought to remedie, being moſt exceſſive extortion in the Eccleſiaſtical Courts, the Biſhops cry out; Sacriledge, the Church goes to ruine, as it did in *Bohemia*, with the Schiſme of the *Huſſites*, *Ibid.* After this, though the Biſhops ceaſed to be Papiſts; for they preached againſt the Popes Supremacie, to pleaſe the King, yet they ceaſed not to oppugne the Goſpel, cauſing *Tindals* Tranſlation to be burnt, yea, they agreed to the ſuppreſſing of Monaſteries, leaving their revenues to the King, to make vvay for the ſix bloudy Articles, which proceedings with all cruelty of inquiſition are ſet down, *Holinſh. pag.* 946. till they were repealed the ſecond of *Edward* the Sixth, ſtopping in the mean while the cauſe of Reformation well begun by the Lord *Cromwel.* And this miſchief was wrought by *Steven Gardiner*, Biſhop of *Wincheſter*. The ſix Articles are ſet down in *Speed*, *pag.* 792.

*Speed* 784. *Hol.* 992, *Speed* 792. *Speed. Statut. Hen.* 8. *Anno* 35. *cap.* 5.

The Archbiſhop of Saint *Andrews*, his hindring of *England*, and *Scotlands* Union, for fear of Reformation, *Speed* 794.

*Edward* 6. As for the dayes of King *Edward* the Sixth, we cannot but acknowledge to the glory of the rich mercy of God, that there was a great Reformation of Religion made even to admiration. And yet notwithſtanding we do much diſlike the humour of thoſe, that cry up thoſe dayes as a compleat pattern of Reformation, and that endevour to reduce our Religion to the firſt times of King *Edward*, which we conceive were comparatively very imperfect, there being foure impediments which did much hinder that bleſſed work.

The three Rebellions. One in *Henry* the Eighths time, by the Prieſts of *Lincoln* and *Yorkſhire*, for that Reformation which

*Crom-*

Cromwel had made. The other two in King *Edwards* dayes. One in *Cornwal*, the other in *Yorkshire*.

The ſtrife that aroſe ſuddenly amongſt the Peers, emulating one anothers honour, *Speed, pag.* 837.

The violent oppoſition of the Popiſh Biſhops, which made *Martin Bucer* write to King *Edward* in his Book *de Regno Chriſti, lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. and ſay, Your Majeſty doth ſee, that this reſtoring again the Kingdom of Chriſt, which we require, yea, which the ſalvation of us all requireth, may in no wiſe be expected to come from the Biſhops, ſeeing there be ſo few among them which do underſtand the power and proper Offices of this Kingdom; and very many of them by all means (which poſſibly they can and dare) either oppoſe themſelves againſt it, or defer and hinder.

The deficiency of zeal and courage even in thoſe Biſhops who afterwards proved Martyrs, witneſs the ſharp contention of *Ridley* againſt *Hooper* for the ceremonies. And the importunate ſuit of *Cranmer* and *Ridley* for toleration of the Maſs for the Kings ſiſter, which was rejected by the Kings not only reaſons, but tears; whereby the young King ſhewed more zeal then his beſt Biſhops, 839.

The inhumane butcheries, blood-ſheddings, and cruelties of *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and the reſt of the Biſhops in Queen *Maries* dayes, are ſo freſh in every mans memory, as that we conceive it a thing altogether unneceſſary to make mention of them. Only we fear leſt the guilt of the blood then ſhed, ſhould yet remain to be required at the hands of this Nation, becauſe it hath not publickly endeavoured to appeaſe the wrath of God by a general and ſolemn humiliation for it.

What the practices of the Prelates have been ever ſince, from the begininning of Queene *Elizabeth* to this preſent day, would fill a volume (like *Ezekiels* Roll) with lamentation, mourning, and wo to record. For it hath been their great deſigne to hinder all further Reformation; to bring in doctrines of Popery, Arminianiſme, and Libertiniſme, to maintain, propagate and much encreaſe the burden of hrmane ceremonies: to keep out, and beat down the Preaching of the Word, to ſilence the faithfull Preachers of it, to oppoſe and perſecute the moſt zealous profeſſours, and to turn all Religion into a pompous out-ſide; and to tread down the power of godlineſs. Inſomuch as it is come to an ordinary Proverb, that when any thing is ſpoiled, we uſe to ſay, *The Biſhop's foot hath been in it*. And in this (and much more which might be ſaid) fulfilling Biſhop *Bon-*

*ners*

*ners* Prophecie, who when he saw that in King *Edward's* reformation, there was a reservation of Ceremonies and Hierarchy, is credibly reported to have used these words: *Since they have begun to taste of our Breath, it will not be long ere they will eat of our Beef.*

# FINIS.